

DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 334 144

SO 030 290

AUTHOR Bjerstedt, Ake, Ed.
TITLE Perspectives on Peace Education: Interviews with Experts from Fourteen Countries. Educational Information and Debate. 89.
INSTITUTION Lund Univ. (Sweden). Malmo School of Education.
REPORT NO ISSN-0479-7736
PUB DATE 90
NOTE 206p.; For a related document, see SO 030 289.
PUB TYPE Collected Works - General (020) -- Reports - Descriptive (141)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC09 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Elementary Secondary Education; Foreign Countries; International Education; *International Educational Exchange; International Relations; Interviews; *Peace; *Role of Education; *War; World Affairs; Youth
IDENTIFIERS *Peace Education

ABSTRACT

The project group, Preparedness for Peace, at the Malmo School of Education in Sweden studies ways of helping children and young people deal constructively with questions of peace and war. As part of this work, the project collects viewpoints on the role of schools in pursuit of "peace preparedness." A number of experts with special interest and competence in areas related to peace education are interviewed. This book presents conversations with 14 individuals, representing 14 different countries and a variety of professional backgrounds. (Author)

* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *

ED 331 144

BJERSTEDT (ED.)

MSE

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION
CENTER (ERIC)

☒ This document has been reproduced as
received from the person or organization
originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve
reproduction quality.

- Points of view or opinions stated in this docu-
ment do not necessarily represent official
OERI position or policy.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS
MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

AKE BJERSTEDT

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES
INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

Perspectives
on
peace education

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

SO \$30 290

PERSPECTIVES ON PEACE EDUCATION

**Interviews with experts
from fourteen countries**

**Editor:
Åke Bjerstedt**

The project group "Preparedness for Peace" at the Malmö School of Education in Sweden studies ways of helping children and young people to deal constructively with questions of peace and war. As part of this work, the project collects viewpoints on the role of schools in pursuit of "peace preparedness". A number of experts with special interest and competence in areas related to peace education are interviewed.

This book presents such conversations with fourteen individuals, representing fourteen different countries and a variety of professional backgrounds.

1990
Published and distributed by:
Department of Educational and Psychological Research
School of Education, Box 23501
S-200 45 Malmö, Sweden

Printed by:
Graphic Systems, Malmö, Sweden

Contents

Introduction	5
Anima Bose (India)	7
Birgit Brock-Utne (Norway)	18
Robin Burns (Australia)	38
Morton Deutsch (The United States)	49
Virginia Floresca-Cawagas (The Philippines)	66
Søren Keldorff (Denmark)	78
Stig Lindholm	92
Valentina Mitina (The Soviet Union)	107
Hanns-Fred Rathenow (Western Germany)	120
Douglas Ray (Canada)	135
Paul Smoker (The United Kingdom)	156
Lennart Vriens (The Netherlands)	172
Riitta Wahlström (Finland)	187
Zlmarian J. Walker (Brazil)	198

Introduction

The project group "Preparedness for Peace", working at the Department of Educational and Psychological Research, the Malmö School of Education in Sweden, explores ways of helping children and young people to deal constructively with questions of peace and war. As part of its work, the project group collects viewpoints on the role of schools in pursuit of "peace preparedness". A number of experts with special interest and competence in areas related to peace education have been interviewed.

This report presents such conversations with fourteen persons representing a variety of geographical and professional backgrounds: Anima Bose (India), Birgit Brock-Utne (Norway), Robin Burns (Australia), Morton Deutsch (The United States), Virginia Floresca-Cawagas (The Philippines), Søren Keldorff (Denmark), Stig Lindholm (Sweden), Valentina Mitina (The Soviet Union), Hanns-Fred Rathenow (The Federal Republic of Germany), Douglas Ray (Canada), Paul Smoker (The United Kingdom), Lennart Vriens (The Netherlands), Riitta Wahlström (Finland), and Zlmarian J. Walker (Brazil).

Some notes on the interviewees are given after each conversation. The structure and fullness of detail vary here due to the fact that these notes have been put together at different times and with different types of information from the interviewees. No attempt has been made to reorganize or "equalize" these notes for the present publication.

Ake Bjerstedt
Interviewer

Anima Bose

1.

AB: As an introduction, could you say a few words about yourself and your interest in the field of "peace education"?

AB: My area of studies has been history, especially modern history of India, and sociology. When I came to America in 1965, I was teaching history of India under "India Study". But my students at the university told me: Really we don't want to study history of India - we want to study about Gandhi. I said: Yes, I could initiate Gandhian Study if your university will allow it; and I got the permission. Because of teaching this particular course, I myself studied Gandhi in greater depth, and it led to some rethinking. Since then I have been teaching nothing but Gandhian studies and peace education in the academia.

I have also written books - out of my nine books, three are devoted to peace-related topics: One is about peace movements and history, the other is about Gandhi, and the third deals with dimensions of peace and nonviolence in our time. (See list of selected publications below.) The other six books are related to higher education, literature etc.

2.

AB: What do you think of first when you hear the words "peace education"?

AB: Three things. When I first heard the word "peace education", it struck me that you cannot teach peace, it has to be learnt as practitioners. That's no. 1. No. 2: Peace education must include a course which we may call "live it" course; an apprenticeship, as it were. If you want to find out what violence is, as a student, you have to go out in the real world and find out what violence is, what your solutions

are, how you see peace can be brought about. That is, finding it out experientially. Finally, peace education is especially important in our time and day, when we see how we have been overcome by violence. We have even made violence a part of our entertainment, part of our leisure-time hobbies. For example, look at some films, there may be 250 incidents of violence in a film of 2½ hours - unbelievable! TV-programs are often full of violence. So for understanding peace, nonviolence and peace education are utterly imperative in our time. That's my reaction.

AB: Is it correct that you work at a center devoted to peace education?

AB: Yes, I have a center, which is a center for peace education, that gives and develops courses. There are work-shops both for students and teachers at different levels, college, university and also school levels. Then we develop courses, and we give consultancy. We are consulted by the National Council for Educational Research and Training in Education (NCERT) of India which helps introducing textbooks for teachers.

AB: Is this center part of a university?

AB: No. As one of the founders of the centre, I have stood for autonomy. I have learnt from Gandhian study that if you want to be creative, and if you want to be really free in your movement, then you must give up the habit of taking aid from the government. The government that governs the least, is the best government for me. So my center is a private organization, but I do also give lectures in a university, the J.N. University, which includes Gandhian studies.

3.

AB: If you think back on your own school days, were there some aspects in your schooling that might be considered an attempt at "peace education"?

AB: It is a very good question. I have tried to go back on my own school days, but no, I cannot think of

anything that was close to peace education. In the mornings, at our school, we used to have a prayer. We sang some songs, and the principal gave us a brief address on values, health and social responsibility. Incidentally, the principal happened to be my mother, Mrs. N. Bhattacharji, Jagat Taran Girls' High School, in Allahabad, India, which later became a degree College. But peace was not an emphasis. Competition was emphasized: you must win, you must do well in life, you must come first in class and so on.

4.

AB: Do you believe that schools in your country, as you know them today, contributes to a "peace education"?

AB: India is, as you know, a very large country. The central government has a ministry of education, but the 21 provinces also have their ministries of education. So we have a complicated situation where it is very difficult to generalize. There cannot be any uniformity. In a general way, in India today, there is a great consciousness about peace and non-violence. Mahatma Gandhi lived in this country and played an important role. Including Gandhi in study courses is not unusual, and when you read Gandhi, his concepts of peace and ahimsa are often taken up. When Indian people travel to conferences such as IPRA, they meet people of other countries. Some conferences and discussions have inspired some Indian teachers to say: Why don't we have peace studies and peace education in our country? I myself, have worked very hard for many years in my country to make peace a part of the core curricula. This has become a very important work in my life.

So I would say, yes, I do believe schools in my country make some contributions to peace education, but certainly they don't have peace education courses. They take up the life of Gandhi, or present the life of some other peace-makers from other countries. They may have a peace club, which is an extra-curricular

support group. There are several universities - such as, Mahatma Gandhi University in Kerala; Madurai University, Tamil Nadu; J.N.U. (Jawaharlal Nehru University) in Delhi; Punjab University, Chandigarh - that include peace studies in their B.A. and M.A. courses. There are several schools that try to include aspects of peace education, but in an interdisciplinary way. In the children's schools, there are a lot of activities that support this peace education, such as, story telling, games, singing together, play acting.

AB: Is there any central recommendation in any texts, saying that peace education should be dealt with in schools?

AB: No, not in the curricula. That is our mission now that peace education must be a part of the core curricula, literature, life science, history, geography. I stand for peace education as a part of the core curricula. But so far it has not been accepted. By part of the core curricula I mean, peace education should become a subject as any other subject, namely, history, geography, mathematics and so on.

I might add that I think we should be very aware of terminologies. I don't think I will encourage my children to learn the words: "1st world", "2nd world", and "3rd world" - these are subtly violent words, because they begin with the notion of someone being superior, someone inferior; someone better, someone worse. Violence can be overt, covert and subtle. One recognizes overt violence, but covert or subtle violence is not easily detected. Terminologies can promote subtle violence. And that is dangerous.

5.

AB: Do you think it is at all possible for schools to contribute to "peace education"? If so, what are some of the steps and measures to be taken that you think of first?

AB: Yes. First of all, children should learn what peace means, what peace is, what peace stands for. In informal education, which begins at home, where you have the first socialization, parents have their duty to pay attention that the values of peace and the ways of peace and nonviolence are inculcated in their children. In the formal school education, every student must have an opportunity for peace education. We have to let teachers and parents know why peace education is necessary. They do need to be oriented toward this particular area. It's a new word; many people don't understand why it's so vital. We also have to realize that violence can be of various types - overt, covert, subtle, passive - and we have to learn to perceive them. Peace as "no war" is too simplistic an idea. If there is no war in a country and there are injustice, poverty, economic discrimination, inequity, can we say that this country has peace?

AB: Do you think that peace education should be a special school subject or should it be included in the different school subjects?

AB: Both are possible. But I think it should be a specific subject where we deal with, for instance: "What is peace", or "The faces of violence", then give examples. The ways of conflict resolution are important. The students should also make observations about violence in their own community: "Do you have slum areas, and do you have violence in these slum areas?" "Do you see violence between parents in your house?" "Do you see violence in the administration of your school?" "Do you see violence in the shops and the commercial area?" "Do you see violence in the marriage customs?"

AB: When you talk about a specific course, do you think there is a specific age for that?

AB: I think, yes. In the first place, materials are needed for age 13 or 14 to the end of the school years. Then, there should be specific courses at the university

level. But peace education issues should also be dealt with by the primary school teachers at the children's level.

I myself have gone to pre-kindergarten groups, and had discussions with the boys and girls as to how they would react when some children want to fight. These very elementary things can also be seen as means of peace education. There can be several examples. The situations could be simulated.

For all these tasks, teacher training is utterly important. The teacher is the most important, the most responsible person in any peace education course at any level. Very importantly, the teacher must believe in peace and nonviolence. Or else, he or she should not undertake to teach peace education courses, peace-studies courses.

6.

AB: What would be some of the possible differences in peace education approaches among younger and older students in schools?

AB: For younger students, the example of the teacher and the example of the parents at home are very important. Also, the parent-teacher cooperation is important. What the teacher says and does, and what the parents say or do reflect their values. If the children see contradictory values, they may get very upset. But at the university level, I think, the teachers and students become partners. This opens up other possibilities in peace education also. There need not be many books, but effective books would be needed, and if necessary, written.

AB: Now you separated the university students from the others, but if you think of the school level, there is a wide range of ages. Would there be some differences in how you handle peace education within that range?

AB: There would be differences related to the age of the students and their development, of course, but even

at the age of 16 or 17, if a young person is still in school, he/she is, in many ways, different from the university student. He lives within a school world, dominated by the teachers as teachers - not as partners.

7.

AB: If you were an upper-secondary school teacher in a subject with which you are particularly familiar, how would you like to make the students more conscious of and more prepared for problems of peace, within that subject?

AB: I could talk about history. We have been teaching too much about wars and victories. Why do we talk about Alexander the Great? Is he great just because he had many military victories? So some old clichés of history will need to be discarded. History has also, often, been presented from a nationalistic point of view, or a partisan point of view, or with a one-sided ideological point of view. History as a school subject must be more objective and multi-cultural, and it must show that peace also has its glory. I would like to have my students study Gandhi historically and his concept of nonviolence, so that they themselves will understand that killing is always bad (even when you seem to have noble reasons in a freedom struggle), and that life is always sacred. The question of means and end must be revolutionised. Ends cannot justify the means. Means must be as noble as the ends always.

8.

AB: In international debates, the terms "disarmament education" and "peace education" have been used, in addition to some other related terms ("global education", "education for international understanding" etc.). Do you have any comments and preferences as to this terminology?

AB: I prefer peace education, very definitely. "Dis-

armament education" is not necessarily peace education; it is some kind of negative expression. You may want "global education" for political reasons or economic gain, but it may not be for peace, unless you bring in the world as a family and the fact that we are interdependent. If you bring in these factors, then why call it "global education"? "International understanding" could be a factor in peace, I will admit that, but this expression may also be used for financial or foreign policy reasons. We need to be very clear about our educational objectives. And why should we play with words? It is a trick, I think. Some people say to me: "international understanding" or "global education" are better terms, because they are attractive to more people. But we are not people pleasers, we are peace educators. So let us stick to "peace education". And peace education in the classroom could be supported by peace clubs; what the students cannot do within the classroom could be done in the peace clubs. "Peace studies" could be another terminology - if not peace education.

9.

AB: In many countries, questions related to disarmament and peace are highly controversial. Would you anticipate any difficulties, for example with parents or other members of the community, when introducing peace education in schools? If so, what kind of difficulties? Do you see any way out of such problems?

AB: I have met this situation in the United States. For example, when I have been given lectures to church groups. And I have experienced it in West Germany where I have been visiting. But in India I have not faced it. Indians are very traditional and tend to respect what is done in the school. If the school is giving a particular course, they will take it without questioning it. Also Gandhi's name is very important in India, and he is associated with peace and non-violence unambiguously.

10.

AB: What needs to be done in teacher training in order to prepare future teachers more adequately for the area of "peace education"?

AB: Values are very important. The young teachers have often learnt to be competitive and they have become used to the violence of language. For example, in Northern Ireland, I conducted a seminar for school teachers in 1978. Many of these teachers said they could not quite understand peace and nonviolence because throughout their life they have seen "violence" as the way of life. So in fact, they have to unlearn many things. This is the first thing. Secondly, teacher training courses will have to be built up in the teacher training colleges, directly dealing with peace education, and in these courses field work is very important where they can discern subtle, covert, overt violence, and where they can use non-violence as the alternative way of life.

I would also say that there should be some kind of award for a good peace teacher. We need to use incentives. We also need carefully written textbooks which deal with peace education, nonviolence and conflict resolution in a nonviolent way where no one wins.

AB: Are there any specific teacher manuals in India about peace education?

AB: Not yet, but they are in the process of preparing such manuals. They are aware of the need.

11.

AB: Is there anything else that you would like to add about the school and peace education?

AB: I think international conferences dealing with issues of peace and peace education can be very important. Teachers from different countries could be invited as participants. Inclusiveness is very important; these conferences should not be limited to the academia only.

Authors have an important part to play here, not just the text-book writers, but also other authors writing books based on peace and non-violence. Such books should be widely circulated and should be within the financial reach of interested buyers.

There is now some awareness of the importance of peace studies and peace education at the university level, but so far too little has been done in this area. People must begin to gossip in the bazaars and exchange views as to why peace education is that imperative. The discussions about peace education, peace and nonviolence must not be confined within the four walls of the academia. Then peace education will become divorced from life, reality and to-day's need. Peace education must remain a part of life - an imperative part of education for life.

NOTES ON THE INTERVIEWEE

Anima Bose. Address: 1, Sikandra Road, New Delhi - 110 001, India.

Education: M.A. History, Allahabad University, India.
- D.S.W., Institute of Social Studies, The Hague, Holland.
- Diploma of Social Studies, postgraduate, London University. - Ph.D., History, minor field Sociology, University of Kansas, Lawrence, Kansas, USA.

Professional experience, for example: Professor of History, Loreto College, Calcutta University. - Professor of History, St. Xavier's College, Bombay University, Bombay. - Visiting Professor: College of Wooster, Ohio, USA; Portland State University, Portland, Oregon, USA; and St. Louis University, Missouri, USA. - Consultant for development of peace study courses, Northern Ireland. - Teape Lecturer in Cambridge, UK.

Teaching fields: Medieval and modern cultural history of India, Gandhian studies, Nonviolence and social change, Peace movements in history.

Selected publications

Mahatma Gandhi: A contemporary perspective. New Delhi: D.K. Publishers, 1977.

History of higher education in India and the American involvement. Calcutta: Punthi Pustak, 1978.

Gandhian perspective on peace. Journal of Peace Research, 1981, 18(2).

Peace education in senior schools in Delhi - The workshop findings, 1982-83. (Paper, IPRA Conference, Gyor, Hungary, 1983.)

Peace movements in history. New Delhi, 1983.

Peace in India's history. Gandhi Marg, 1985.

Dimensions of peace and nonviolence: The Gandhian perspective. New Delhi: Gian Publishing House, 1987.

1.

AB: As an introduction, could you say a few words about yourself and your interest in the field of "peace education"?

BB: In a way, I think that I became interested in this field even as a child, as the daughter of a German mother. My mother came to Norway just before the war, and I was born just before the war broke out. She had been forced to leave her job because she was so strongly anti-Nazi, and she married my father. I learned to speak German, since my mother knew very little Norwegian. At the same time, my father was working in an underground movement against the Germans. As a child during the war, I learned that one was not to speak German on the street, and I learned, for example, not to sing German lullabies. For a long time in Norway, it was important to be bad in German in school. Since the Germans were so hated I got into fights in the schoolyard, because I was teased for being the daughter of a German. At the same time, of course, I liked my mother and my maternal grandmother. I therefore realized very early that there are differences between governments and people, and that not all Germans were dangerous or wicked. I think I probably became interested at an early stage in trying to understand how prejudices about groups arise, and what we can do to counteract that.

Then I went to high school, enrolled in an experimental course connected with UNESCO's Associated Schools Project. We studied the same subjects as those in the ordinary English course, but the content and the emphasis were different. We paid a lot of attention to the United Nations system and the declaration of human rights, for example. That meant a lot to me.

After graduation, I received a scholarship to the U.S.A. and there I became involved in something called the Model United Nations, arranged by American universities every year: a mock United Nations conference, where the participants go through the whole agenda that is to be taken up in the U.N., and where different universities play the roles of different nations. Stanford University, which I was attending, represented the United States. I was on the committee for social and human rights, and I was supposed to represent the U.S.A. These experiences undoubtedly contributed to my interest in the field we are discussing now, and I have subsequently, during my continuing studies, become very absorbed with questions concerning war, peace and prejudices in many connections.

Among other things, in 1975 I made an investigation into children's attitudes towards foreign countries, and I have had occasion to refer to that study in various situations. I worked with the Ministry for Church and Education for three years. There I was asked a number of times to speak about peace education by Under Secretary of State Ingrid Eide, whom I knew as a colleague at the university.

Then I was appointed by the Norwegian UNESCO Commission to lead a group that was to prepare for Norway's participation in the World Disarmament Education Congress, arranged by UNESCO in 1980. Among other things, I then wrote an article on disarmament education in Norway. That led to an invitation from researchers at the Peace Research Institute in Oslo (PRIO) - who often received questions about peace education, but who had not worked very much in that area - to work there on issues involved in peace education for a year.

That meant that I began to work more systematically on peace education matters. At that same time, I also received a UNESCO assignment concerning women's role,

as mothers, in fostering peace. It was probably when I began to work on that assignment that the importance of combining research about women and women's education with peace issues first occurred to me. It is actually quite amazing how seldom those engaged in peace education look into the extraordinary differences in our ordinary rearing of girls and boys where violence and aggression are concerned.

That became an important theme in my report to UNESCO, and then in the book where I developed it further, "Educating for Peace: A Feminist Perspective" (New York: Pergamon Press, 1985). To some extent, the book had the character of a debate, and it provoked several kinds of reactions. One professor in Australia, who used my publication as a textbook, thought it would be a good idea if I were to come out, for example, with a new version going more systematically into a number of feminist perspectives. The book is used at several universities in the U.S., not only in peace studies but in other areas as well. It was an important inspiration to develop my thinking further when, in the spring of 1986, I was a key note lecturer at the University of Oregon. In the spring of 1987 I was invited on a lecturing tour of other American universities, among them the University of Illinois, Indiana University and Ohio State University. Another source of inspiration was the Forum for Women's Studies at Umeå University, Sweden. I was scholar-in-residence there in the fall of 1986, and lectured on feminist theories about peace and peace education. With the help of a research leave from my university, and with tutorial assistance primarily from Håkan Wiberg, I revised my work further, into a more academic version, "Feminist Perspectives on Peace and Peace Education". That version was my doctoral dissertation, defended in Oslo (June 1988) - the first doctorate in Norway in peace research. I have now revised it as a book, published by Pergamon Press in 1989.

I have also touched on this theme in a background document for the UN Decade for Women conference in Nairobi in 1985 (a document that was at first regarded as too feminist), and in a contribution to the IPRA Conference in Sussex in 1986. Among other things, I have played different feminist perspectives off against one another: one, more liberal, focusing on equality and non-discrimination, and the other, more radical, stressing liberation from traditional and capitalist structures and the creation of something new. There is an important difference between "getting a bigger share of the pie" and "changing the basic recipe of the pie". In this work I have also had the support and inspiration of other women peace researchers; we have a network, and we thought that the meeting we had in Sussex was good in many ways.

AB: In addition to working with surveys of research and theories, you are apparently also involved in empirical work on the rearing of sons. Can you say something about that?

BB: Yes. That has to do with my interest in male socialization, in how we bring up our boys. I have been interested in the possibility of "legitimizing a new kind of man", and have given thoughts to the possibilities of giving a man status in ways other than through aggression and violence.

What I am involved with concretely now is a three-year research project, supported by NAVF, going on until 1990. I have a male assistant, Bjørnar Sarnes.

We are interviewing 40 mothers and 40 fathers who have sons between the ages of 10 and 20. Half of the mothers are "feminist oriented" (they don't have to call themselves feminists, but they must have had contact with, and associate themselves with, the women's movement, and they must have been employed fulltime while their sons were small), while the other half of the mothers are "housewives" (they have stayed at home and do not associate themselves with the women's movement). We have two similar groups among the fathers.

One-half are "critical of sex-roles and conscious", i.e. they are men who have involved themselves in the debate about sex roles and who have spent more time than usual with children; in other words, they are men who have problematized the male role. (We got in touch with some of them through a crisis center for men.) The other half consists of a more traditional group of men.

We conduct extended (hour-and-a-half) in-depth interviews with the mothers and fathers. The format is a structured conversation, where we touch upon their goals as parents of sons, and their aspirations for their sons' development. We ask specifically what their sons usually do (what leisure activities they have and what contributions they make at home, as members of the household). We inquire about how our respondents feel about violence, and about military service. We also ask the fathers about their attitudes towards this business of being a man, and we ask the mothers about their definition of the "ideal man". If daughters are also part of the family, we ask the parents if they make any distinction between rearing sons and daughters.

Thus far, I have analyzed the first seven interviews with mothers, and written a little article based on this preliminary material. The article is included in a book I have edited in collaboration with my assistant (Brock-Utne, B. & Sarnes, B. (Eds.) "Når gutter blir menn" / "When Boys Become Men"/. Oslo: Universitetsforlaget, 1987), a book that includes such contributions as studies of how boys play in playgrounds, observations of men in bars and restaurants, etc.

It is too early to draw any final conclusions based on our interviews, because we have analyzed only part of the material. But what has astonished me in these first analyses is how afraid even the "feminist" mothers have been to intrude too much on the upbringing of boys, how little they have done to alter traditional sex-role patterns. A certain influence has occurred

with regard to household chores - getting boys to accept more of the common duties, or teaching them to use sewing machines, and so on. On the other hand, they do almost nothing to prevent boys from playing war games and being violent outside the home.

It's an entirely different situation when it comes to daughters. The "feminists" have often tried to influence their daughters strongly. They buy their daughters football helmets, and try to encourage them to be tough, strong and independent. They obviously want the girls to measure up to their own ideals for a feminist. But they seem to be afraid of intervening too much when it comes to boys. I can frankly say that I am somewhat disappointed in this regard. I had hoped that mothers with a feminist attitude would have wanted to rear their sons to become gentle and non-sexist men.

AB: You surely have a number of personal experiences in this respect?

BB: Yes, I have, and they have contributed to my involvement in these issues. I have been acutely aware of the sex-role problems in my relations with my sons, and I have seen how difficult it can be to deviate from the traditional ones. I have found it much easier to educate my daughter who can just model herself after me and who has become assertive and outspoken.

My oldest son, Karsten, had one period full of problems as a child. For a while he had trouble making friends, because he was different: he drew, he worked with pottery, and he was full of imagination; on top of that he had a mother who didn't let him have war toys or get into fights. When he was 14 or 15, he rebelled against me for the first time: he was going to take up karate. We had heated discussions, where I said that I did not like violence, but that I had to respect his right to decide what he wanted to do. He, for his part, thought that I ought to admit that it could be good for him. In retrospect, I believe he was right. His non-violent upbringing had made him feel a need to know that he was physically strong, that he needn't be afraid to intervene if the occasion should

arise. He wanted to be in good physical condition, to be able to show he was not afraid, to be able to ski on one foot - things like that.

When he got to be 16 and 17, it was easier. That may have partly been associated with our moving to Tromsø, where he made new friends. Eventually, he became something of an "ideal man" as far as I was concerned, my best example of peace fostering. He also became a conscientious objector. He participated in peace marches and always had the broken rifle symbol on his jacket. As you know, he died in an auto accident, and I have written about him in a book where I talk about my grief but also about the education of a boy to pacifism. ("En mors tåre: Vi som mister våre barn på veiene" / "A Mother's Tears: We Who Lose Our Children On the Highways" / Oslo: Ida forlag og bokverksted, 1986.) That book, incidentally, has been much discussed in Norway. It appears to have helped many people handle their grief, and every week I receive letters from people who are grateful for the book. It is also used in the nurse's training programs in Oslo and in psychology courses at the University of Bergen.

Karsten's youngest brother, Gunnar, who is now 11 and attends the Swedish School in Dar es Salaam, has had problems like his brother's. He, too, has problems with friends, and with being a little different. He is very articulate and likes to talk about things, but he is no football-player. He prefers to sing and draw.

By the way, I have recently given a lecture for the Nordic association of sports researchers, in which I spoke on "Masculinity, Sports and Education for Violence", and talked a little about my sons. Sports can involve both "power to" and "power over", but in my view the trend has been far too much towards "power over". You must be aggressive on the soccer field to be respected, and everything centers on competition. In my opinion, competition receives too

much emphasis both in sports and in school. That, incidentally, was also the reason for our deciding to send Gunnar to the Swedish School, and not the International School, while we are in Tanzania. The International School has a rigid system of competition and grading.

2.

AB: What do you think of first when you hear the words "peace education"?

BB: Of course, both "peace" and "peace education" are used in many different ways. One observes differences in their use by governments in east and west, and one also finds differences in our western countries between conservative and social democratic governments. In Norway the conservatives associate peace education with defense and security, and they have introduced something about NATO as a peace organization into their formulations. Personally, I think about entirely different peace organizations and it would never occur to me to call NATO a peace organization. The Social Democrats in Norway, when talking about peace education, have been more concerned with discussing non-violent solutions, and generally adopt a viewpoint closer to the reasoning in the recommendations of the UN and UNESCO.

To me, peace education implies both education about peace and education for peace. Education for peace is a broad subject, connected to democracy in school and the attempts to create an open and cooperative classroom atmosphere, among other things. It is quite natural for a pedagogue to include such things. But if one approaches this subject from the point of view of political science, for example, or if one is a peace researcher of a more traditional kind, the tendency is rather to regard peace education as instruction about peace and war, and one is very often of the opinion that the primary objective is to

disseminate the results of peace research.

I personally think that both things are important. There are some facts about which more information is needed, e.g. that it is not correct that the arms industry creates more employment opportunities. Furthermore, the general public has not been very well informed about a number of NATO doctrines.

The discussion of the concept of peace is an extremely important part of peace research. A number of young and more radical peace researchers have sometimes accused their senior colleagues of only thinking about peace as the absence of military violence, even when that can mean ignoring a great deal of injustice. The older peace researchers, for their part, have accused their junior colleagues of using the word "peace" where they really should use the word "revolution", and consequently marketing revolution under the label "peace". These are among the extremes in the debate. In all circumstances, it is important to observe different kinds of violence on different levels. Johan Galtung wrote about this in terms of direct and structural violence as early as the 1960s, but it has not always received adequate attention.

AB: There have been some discussions in Sweden about the term "fredsfostran" ("peace fostering") vis-à-vis the term "fredsundervisning" (approx. "peace teaching"). Has that also been discussed in Norway?

BB: Yes, to some extent. We encounter a difficulty in our languages which doesn't exist in English, where "education" covers both concepts. In English, on the other hand, a distinction is customarily made between "education for peace" which I would translate as "peace fostering", and "education about peace". This type of peace education primarily involves cognition, and is usually taken up in the upper grades in school, whereas peace fostering or educating for peace is something that, in principle, is begun at birth.

AB: With regard to the input of the school, in Norway you usually talk mainly about "fredsundervisning". Is that true even when you think about the school's non-cognitive input?

BB: We are not particularly consistent in our use of terminology, but we tend to use the word "fredsundervisning" when we are dealing with the formal institution called "school". Now that I have myself written about feminist perspectives on "peace education", I have distinguished between "peace education in the non-formal sector" (meaning upbringing, and influences from home, parents and peer groups, as well as from the leisure environment, e.g. sports, the media, and toys) and "peace education in the formal sector" (meaning what the schools have to offer). In my forthcoming book I make a distinction between the formal curriculum of the school where one may talk of education about peace and the hidden curriculum where you find more of what I would call education for peace or often for oppression.

When Håkan Wiberg read the manuscript of my new book, he thought that I was rather too negative in my judgement of the school's possibilities. I have participated in a SIPRI project on cultural influences in relation to war and the environment, where I wrote about the education sector and others wrote about other areas. We remarked just recently, on the occasion of a general discussion, that we all seem to tend to be a little pessimistic when it comes to our special areas of competence. (Brock-Utne, B. "Formal Education as a Force in Shaping Cultural Norms towards War and the Environment", in Westling, A. (Ed.), "Cultural Norms in Relation to War and the Environment". Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1988.) Obviously there is much that can be done in school, but it is also perfectly obvious that the system one works in imposes certain limits. So what one can do then is

to train students also to become critical to the educational system they are part of. (I am thinking, for example, of such things as the competition for grades.)

3.

AB: If you think back on your own school days, were there some aspects in your schooling that might be considered attempts at "peace education"?

BB: Yes, but I probably had a rather unique situation in that respect. As I mentioned earlier, during my last three years in school I was in an internationally-oriented experimental course connected to a UNESCO experiment. Even in elementary school I had a woman teacher who was ahead of her times in many regards. She used group work and newspaper texts, and we had many discussions about foreign policy questions even in the 6th grade. She herself received harsh criticism from the other teachers, who thought that such matters had nothing to do with school. But it was very interesting and absorbing, and I remember that I came to her defense.

4.

AB: Do you believe that schools in Norway, as you know them today, contribute to a "peace education"?

BB: That's difficult to answer. As a scholar I should point out that I do not have any empirical data about that. No survey has been conducted. But of course you receive certain impressions when you travel around as I do, to teacher's conferences, and have contacts in the school. One must be a little careful when summarizing such impressions, since it is naturally those who are especially interested who attend conferences in this area. The same thing is true if one has contacts with an organization like Teachers for Peace: obviously, it is an organization of teachers who are already committed to the issue.

But I can say that there is a relatively large number of teachers who are indeed involved in this area, who participate in discussions and help to develop material, and I can say that the area is so active that it has attracted the interest of publishers. There is great interest, among the teachers, that peace education questions be taken up during in-service courses for teachers, and I receive many invitations to lecture at such courses - far more than I can cope with. I have also given courses about peace education at the university, and those attending the courses have subsequently functioned as instructors in peace education at study days or in-service courses for teachers. So, in short, a good deal of interest in the area has developed during the past several years, even though this interest probably still characterizes only a limited part of the teacher corps.

5.

AB: Do you think it is at all possible for schools to contribute to a "peace education"? If so, what are some of the steps and measures to be taken that you think of first?

BB: Yes, clearly I think it is possible. But there is an enormous difference between what you can and should do on lower and higher grade levels. In the lower grades, the main thrust should be on what we have called "fostering". Thus, one uses the classroom more as a laboratory, in which one may take various kinds of day-to-day conflicts as one's starting point and works on the social atmosphere in the class. Teachers very often notice that some conflict is going on; it may be a matter of mobbing, or of more particular conflicts. It is important to tackle it, analyze it and discuss it. What happened, really? What caused it? What could one have done differently? I think it is very important to learn non-violence, and it is relatively hard to learn. Non-violence craves great imagination, among other things, because

it requires finding new solutions. I think that this is a major assignment for the school, since there are not many other places where people have the chance to learn to solve conflicts non-violently.

After that, one can gradually go further, and show the similarities between those conflicts that exist in the school environment and those on the national and international level, and try to analyze such conflicts as well. It is also important to call attention to the fact that a great many national and international conflicts are, in fact, solved without recourse to violence. The problem is that such cases do not receive much attention, either by the media or by researchers.

As far as the content of peace education is concerned, of course there have been discussions about whether it should be made into a separate subject, or integrated into different subjects. Personally, I think that it should be included in many subjects, and I am rather worried about simply categorizing peace education as a separate subject which may be elected only by a few students in the upper grades.

I was once a member of a departmental group (appointed by the Council for the Upper Secondary School under a Social Democratic government that addressed itself to these questions in Norway. We recommended both options, both integration in different school subjects and creating a special curricular option for the upper grades, and we drew up a curriculum for such a subject. Our proposal was torpedoed by a new Conservative regime, but it reappeared later in a modified form, and the pupils now have the opportunity to elect a special curricular option: "Peace and Security".

AB: What has your experience in Norway been with this option?

BB: I can't really answer that, because I have had no personal contacts, nor have I done any studies of it. In any case, only a limited number of our pupils have the opportunity to choose this particular option.

6.

AB: What would be some of the possible differences in peace education approaches among younger and older students in schools? You have already touched on this, but would you care to expand on it?

BB: Well, as I said, among younger children the emphasis would be on fostering. That also means that I think there would be no reason to go into details - for example, about the armaments race or give details about nuclear weapons. On the other hand, they themselves may ask questions about such things, or say that they are afraid of a nuclear war. In that case, as a teacher you should be prepared to provide sensible answers, appropriate for the age level. You could say, for example, that it is true that nuclear weapons are dangerous, but that many adults are doing all they can to see to it that such weapons will never be used, or that they will be dismantled, and that's the reason why so many teachers and parents take part in peace marches or make speeches about peace.

Otherwise, the most important thing at the lower levels is to become involved with the surrounding social relations, e.g. attitudes towards those who are "different" (who come from foreign countries or who have some kind of disability).

AB: In Sweden, a certain amount of criticism has been directed at peace education, because "it isn't right to frighten small children". Has that kind of resistance also appeared in Norway?

BB: Yes, we've heard that, and the implication has been that the peace movement was creating unnecessary anxiety. Basically, of course, it is the existence of nuclear weapons that creates anxiety, and the child who gets to know about the existence of nuclear weapons, via TV or other means, displays anxiety. And then the teacher must deal with that anxiety. One must, of

course, take age level into consideration, and not, as a teacher, assume the initiative of presenting the younger children with these kinds of weapons problems.

7.

AB: If you were an upper-secondary school teacher in a subject with which you are particularly familiar, how would you like to make the students more conscious of and more prepared for problems of peace, within that subject?

BB: History is a subject in which I am particularly interested, and I think it offers many challenges. It is not, however, so easy for the individual teacher, because, in my opinion, there are fundamental mistakes and distortions in history textbooks, and a lack of research. For example, there has been all too little investigation into, and description of, non-violent solutions of conflicts, which is certainly an area that should occupy a prominent position in peace education.

Another important subject is physics, and one can maintain that the traditional instruction in physics in the schools has been far too narrow. It has been pointed out, for example, that relatively few girls choose to study physics. It is quite possible, however, that the reason for this lies with the traditional way physics is taught. In a project at the University of Oslo, a feminist analysis of instruction in physics and the natural sciences has reached the conclusion that physics has traditionally been too narrow, and that girls drop out because the subject is too little concerned with social and human consequences and lacks an overall perspective (Lie, S. & Sjøberg, S. "Myke jenter i harde fag" / "Soft Girls in Hard Sciences" / Oslo: Universitetsforlaget, 1985). There are physicists who think that physics would benefit from the broader perspective that would result if the reorientation that the girls want for the subject would take place.

8.

AB: In international debates, the terms "disarmament education" and "peace education" have been used, in addition to some other related terms ("global education", "education for international understanding" etc.). Do you have any comments and preferences as to this terminology?

BB: Inasmuch as I work with a broad concept of "peace", I regard "peace education" as a generic term, a kind of umbrella concept. My concept of peace includes the absence of both direct violence and indirect, structural violence, so you could say that "disarmament education", "development education" and "human rights education" are all parts of "peace education".

Some peace education deals mainly with the direct violence between countries, and that approximates what UNESCO means by "disarmament education". Nevertheless, there are several problems of terminology involved when one begins to talk about "education for disarmament" and "education about disarmament". The difference between "education for disarmament" and "education for peace" is not as great as that between "education about disarmament" and "education about peace". On the cognitive level there will be a number of differences.

"Human rights education" can also be regarded as a part of "peace education". Also here it is a question of education about and for human rights. In this area, there has been a certain gradual change and expansion. Previously, the usual point of departure was the more liberal notion of human rights involving freedom of the press, freedom of speech, and the freedom to assemble. Now, however, it is usual to include the freedom from economic oppression: "a hungry man is not a free man". Thus the different concepts overlap to some extent.

Both "human rights education" and "development education" deal with structural violence. "Development

education" concerns the third world, or underdevelopment in our own countries; among other things, it considers questions of equity, of equal distribution of resources.

AB: When these matters are discussed in Norway, do you use such terms as "education for international understanding" or "education for a global perspective"?

BB: Not very often. The expression "international understanding" appears, of course, in UNESCO's recommendations, and it is a common term in connection with UNESCO's Associated Schools Project. It is a broad concept, and hence it has certain similarities with the concept of peace education, but one does not usually include in it, to the same degree, questions of armament races and the like. One thinks more along the lines of understanding among nations and removing prejudices, than of economic and social structures. In any case, I prefer "peace education".

9.

AB: In many countries, questions related to disarmament and peace are highly controversial. Would you anticipate any difficulties, for example with parents or other members of the community, when introducing peace education in schools? If so, what kind of difficulties? Do you see any way out of such problems?

BB: Yes, we can undoubtedly count on such difficulties. As an example, I can tell you about a long debate we had in Norway concerning "political mathematics". In connection with the group I mentioned earlier, which was to prepare Norway's participation in the 1980 World Disarmament Congress, we had a seminar to develop proposals for concrete teaching strategies. We divided ourselves into smaller groups to concentrate on different levels. One group of teachers produced a very ambitious teaching plan for adolescents; it involved integrating social studies and mathematics, and they wanted to try it out in the schools. One of many assignments for the pupils was to find out what one

could buy, and what one could do in their immediate neighborhood in the way of child care centers, recreation centers, and so on, with the amount of money required to purchase an F-16 fighter aircraft. The program functioned extremely well at one of the schools. At another, it produced an outcry. That school was located in a conservative neighborhood with a high socio-economic standard among the parents, and one father in particular (who had a high rank in the military establishment) made an issue out of it, and took it to the Norwegian parliament. There was a protracted debate in the newspapers about "political mathematics", involving teachers who attacked it and teachers who defended it, parents who attacked it, etc. The last chapter consisted of a letter written by the pupils in the class in question. They wrote that they were mature enough to be able to evaluate the teaching they were subjected to (this was in grade 9), and that they resided in an area where they received a lot of indoctrination at home, and that a little exposure to other viewpoints might be good. Furthermore, they wrote, the teachers had taken a very balanced approach, the students were very satisfied, and that was the opinion of the entire class. And they added a postscript: "This letter has not been read by a single adult before we sent it."

Following that episode, I wrote an article on legitimizing peace education ("Legitimering av arbeidet med nedrustningsundervisning i det norske utdanningsverk" / "Legitimizing the Pursuit of Disarmament Studies in Norwegian Education"/, *Forsøksnytt*, 1982, no. 4-5, 91-103). It was obviously high time to look squarely at what had been said about peace education by UNESCO and in the curriculum. That article has subsequently been reissued many times, and used at parents' meetings. Informing parents is one of the best ways to get things done. You show them what is expected of

teachers by the United Nations and by the curriculum guidelines and you solicit their suggestions on how to go about the teaching. That is usually a good beginning, and at the same time, you are probably helping to add nuances to public opinion.

10.

AB: What needs to be done in teacher training in order to prepare future teachers more adequately for the area of "peace education"?

BB: Well, a great deal of what we have been talking about with regard to the schools can also be said to have relevance for teacher training. On this level, too, it is advantageous, for example, to address the question in various connections, e.g. within specific subject areas, like history. I also think, however, that it would be desirable to present peace education as a special course.

AB: Are any special contributions in this area being made at present in teacher training in Norway?

BB: There are several courses, and the topic is mentioned in the curriculum for teacher training schools. In reality, however, it is quite left up to the individual teacher, and I do not think one can say that any particularly systematic contributions are being made in this area at present.

NOTES ON THE INTERVIEWEE

Birgit Brock-Utne. Born in Oslo, 1938; High School diploma, 1956; Recipient of a scholarship to Stanford University, 1957-8; Teacher's Certificate, 1960; Master of Education (M.Ed.) from the University of Illinois, 1964; Accreditation as University Lecturer (major field: education), 1965; Master of Political and Social Science, 1971; Doctor philos. in Peace Research, 1988.

Teacher in the Norwegian educational system on various levels; lecturer in education (1966-73), Tromsø College of Education (at the Malmö School of Education, fall term 1968 - Swedish National Fellowship); Research Consultant at the Norwegian Church and Education Department, 1973-76; Researcher at the Employment Research Institute. Amanuensis from 1977 (and, from 1981, Associate Professor at the Institute for Educational Research, University of Oslo (1981-82, researcher at the Institute for Peace Research). From 1 October 1987 to 1 January 1992, Professor at the Department of Education, University of Dar es Salaam, Tanzania.

Birgit Brock-Utne has written some 180 articles in books and journals, in such areas as educational development, teacher education, peace education and sex-role socialization. Two of her more extensive publications are:

Educating for Peace: A Feminist Perspective. New York, Oxford: Pergamon Press, 1985; second edition, 1987. Translated into Korean (1986), Norwegian (1987) and Italian (1989).

Feminist Perspectives on Peace and Peace Education. New York, Oxford: Pergamon Press, 1989.

Robin Burns

1.

AB: As an introduction, could you say a few words about yourself and your interest in the field of "peace education"?

RB: My background is in development education from the late 60s onwards and particularly through the organization World University Service. As part of that in 1974 I was doing a survey for the Food and Agricultural Organization program. At a conference I met Robin Richardson and Christoph Wulff who then were in charge of the Peace Education Commission of IPRA (International Peace Research Association). They told me about it, and they invited me to correspond with the Peace Education Commission. Finally in 1976 I came to Stockholm to work with Stig Lindholm and then in 1978 came to my first IPRA summer school. Since then I have been involved in work on the relationship between peace and development education.

2.

AB: What do you think of first when you hear the words "peace education"?

RB: The first thing I think of is good education: that peace education implies a commitment not only to a certain educational content but to a pedagogy as well that gives teachers and students alike an opportunity to practice some of the skills and some of the values that peace education is concerned about transmitting.

AB: When you talk about specific skills that peace education should develop, what would you think of?

RB: I think very quickly of the ability to make a critique of the present social order and some of its structures - from the national to the global arena - that I think are anti-peace. Children and adults need the ability to analyze the situation they are in, to reflect on that and to attempt to put some of their

insights into practice as a basis then for new reflections.

AB: So you would see peace education as involved in both some kind of content and in the development of skills, attitudes and preparedness for action?

RB: Yes. But I am least sure of the content.

3.

AB: If you think back on your own school days, were there some aspects in your schooling that might be considered an attempt at "peace education"?

RB: No, I think it was intensely violent. It was a private girls' school dominated by rules and structures, and I hated it.

AB: You went to school in Australia?

RB: Yes.

4.

AB: Do you believe that schools in your country, as you know them today, contribute to a "peace education"?

RB: Formally, peace education has got into some schools in some places, but I think you need to understand that Australia has six states, and each state has its own system. There is also an extensive double private school system - Catholic schools and independent private schools (some Protestant, some not), so it is very hard to generalize. The teacher unions have in response to teachers been doing a lot of work in peace education recently. In my own state, for example, several years ago they got an agreement with the State Government to establish a task force to investigate and promote peace education in the schools.

There is intense opposition from the conservatives. The best general climate for peace education has been in Victoria, where it is officially sponsored by the state. In the other states it has been more difficult. But there are in all of the states strong local groups who are working with teachers.

5.

AB: Do you think it is at all possible for schools to contribute to a "peace education"? If so, what are some of the steps and measures to be taken that you think of first?

RB: I don't believe that schools can do very much - in the most profound sense - but I think they should nevertheless discuss the issue. They need to reflect on types of knowledge that they select for transmission, for example, to what extent there should be such a heavy stress on vocational education. There is need for more emphasis on citizenship education in Australia in a broad sense. We must have means whereby children can begin to understand some of the global issues in school. I am not sure how effectively this can be done. But this doesn't mean that one must not try.

AB: When you say you would like the schools to try - could you give some illustrations of what you have in mind?

RB: Firstly I do not believe that we should have a new subject called Peace Studies. I think it must be a perspective across the curriculum and therefore in this I think you need wiser educators helping teachers to integrate peace issues and peace-related discussions within the normal curricula. The teachers need new knowledge in some subjects - on issues in physical science, for example. But especially, they need encouragement to try new methods and training in handling controversial issues in the classroom and in using working methods that stress cooperation rather than individual competition and assessment. Learning democratic decision-making is to me part of peace education and this needs to be integrated in the school. It's very hard to have three lessons a week with this perspective and the rest of the school completely out of touch with this approach.

AB: Would there be some specific kind of teaching materials that you think would have to be developed?

RB: Yes, but so far there have been few coordinated efforts to do that in Australia. Each state is responsible for education, and in addition, we have a very different situation in each state. In Victoria, there is no general curriculum, and there are no compulsory subjects except English. The state can suggest and provide materials which still have to be taken up on the initiative of individual schools. It is certainly impossible to provide national materials, although there have been some successful projects - they have been trying one in human rights education - but it is mostly a question of guide-lines and suggestions.

AB: Is there some specific Australian publication dealing with these things - a book on peace education in general - that you could recommend?

RB: I am trying to write one. No there is not.

6.

AB: What would be some of the possible differences in peace education approaches among younger and older students in schools?

RB: I find it difficult to answer that without going into a critique of Piaget and Kohlberg on the development of learning and social and moral behaviour. Obviously there are different types of activities and issues, variously suited to different ages, but I think the general belief that we cannot deal with international issues with very young children is beginning to be seen to be false. With young children we should begin to develop concepts and values that go beyond the simple stereotyping of me and my family versus others.

Perhaps the important factor is complexity. The complexity of conflict situations may be more easily handled with older children. Some of the issues I think are important deal with the use of science and technology in society, but obviously when the children

have not yet done much in basic science, they can only begin to talk about science in society. But I think for most of peace education, the basis should be laid in the early school, and then you just, through the disciplines and subjects, step by step develop a complexity.

7.

AB: If you were an upper-secondary school teacher in a subject with which you are particularly familiar, how would you like to make the students more conscious of and more prepared for problems of peace, within that subject?

RB: My academic background is in psychology and social anthropology, and I am really not familiar with any of the more common school subjects.

AB: Would there be something in psychology that you would think would be relevant for a peace education?

RB: We have in Australia a group of "Psychologists for the prevention of nuclear war". They have been dealing with behavior modification and coping skills. This approach is very individually oriented, for instance, to children's fears about a possible nuclear future. I find this approach somewhat limited and hence not a sufficient basis for a good peace education. In social anthropology, we have a basis in the relativity of cultures, demonstrating that a particular phenomenon needs to be understood in its social and cultural setting. This is something that can be taught in the school. We need to understand the world view of other groups and peoples and to be able to talk about other peoples' world views, not in a fragmented manner, focusing on differences but focusing on common basic human needs and the different social and cultural contexts. This is a very good basis for at least part of a peace education.

8.

AB: In international debates, the terms "disarmament education" and "peace education" have been used, in addition to some other related terms ("global education", "education for international understanding" etc.). Do you have any comments and preferences as to this terminology?

RB: I have some problems, having moved from development education to peace education and having used various terms in my own studies. I am working towards a broad concept of social and political education oriented towards critical world issues. It is important to emphasize the interrelations of critical world problems, of which peace is an important example, but which must also include development and underdevelopment, justice, the environment etc.

When talking about global issues with teachers, their reaction is often: It is fine to talk about peace education, but the basic problem in my school is violence on the playground, and this violence comes from poverty and is often directed around newly arrived immigrants. So in that situation, it is useful to begin with the reality of the classroom and the playground and discuss the implications of the multi-cultural society. But it is very short-sighted if we do not add an international perspective. It is important to see that the situation of immigrants in Australia has something to do with the relations between nations.

I would want peace education perhaps to be the broadest concept, but that would then include things like the relationship between human beings and the environment, between the races, the sexes, the rich and the poor.

9.

AB: In many countries, questions related to disarmament and peace are highly controversial. Would you anticipate any difficulties, for example with parents or other members of the community, when introducing peace education in schools? If so, what kind of difficulties? Do you see any way out of such problems?

RB: Yes, there are such problems. This is partly in response to world events and Australia's relations to the United States. Particularly since the New Zealand government refused to accept even potentially nuclear armed ships in its ports, there has been a lot of emphasis on the importance of the American alliance, and recent surveys have shown that support for that alliance has increased in our area. Some people feel that peace education is a threat to this alliance. The conservatives got hold of the debate going on in Britain and immediately started making people in Australia afraid via articles in newspapers and all sorts of places, challenging anyone in peace education, almost calling them traitors, and accused them of indoctrinating children.

AB: Do you think that parents would also be influenced by this discussion?

RB: They are influenced. When it's explained to them they are not so worried, however. The experience of many of the teachers I worked with is that when you say, that you want to talk about peace education in school, parents are often upset and worried. But when you sit down and discuss what that means, then you often get a much more positive response.

In 1977 a very old regulation that said that teachers should not raise controversial political or religious issues in the classroom was changed. It is now rather seen as an obligation of teachers to treat such issues so long as they present a range of views and are not trying to indoctrinate the children. I think that students should be encouraged to debate different points of view. That is good education.

AB: Are there any official texts recommending peace education in the schools?

RB: Two years ago the government passed what has become known as Ministerial Statement No. 6, which includes teaching about issues of war and peace as one of the obligations in the school.

AB: Is that a federal recommendation?

RB: No, it is only a Victoria State text; the Federal government has no mandate to do anything about education.

AB: Would the other states also have similar texts?

RB: No, Victoria has gone further than the other states, partly because of a special relationship with the teacher unions that have given positive support to the government and vice versa. Another way in which new support is coming is through a national curriculum development unit. The way it operates is severely limited by the states. For example, at least two states must give a high priority rating to the things they want done. They are working on some useful materials. If they are requested they can respond with projects and materials, but not with policy statements.

AB: What do you call this unit?

RB: The Curriculum Development Centre. It was set up by the previous Labor government in 1973. When the Liberals came back in, they abolished it, but it has been reorganized again and brought into being again in the last couple of years.

AB: Where is that situated?

RB: In Canberra. It is part of the Federal Department of Education.

10.

AB: What needs to be done in teacher training in order to prepare future teachers more adequately for the area of "peace education"?

RB: That is hard work! In general, unions complain that there is not enough support from the universities.

There are now probably six to ten teacher institutions having courses specifically looking at the issues of peace education.

AB: Are they for teachers who already have finished their basic training?

RB: Mine is, some of the others are not. We have no uniform curriculum for teacher education. One of the problems with the basic education of teachers in the secondary schools is that we only have one year and they have to do 45 days of supervised practical teaching in that, so there is very little room for academic input. So I think the problem goes deeper and that is that we need peace studies in undergraduate courses. But if they come to us with some background in philosophy, social science, sociology and history, then we can work with that in preparing curricula. But they come with very little relevant subject knowledge, and it is very difficult in the basic training to provide both that and pedagogy as well. So I have chosen to work with teachers who were already trained and who come back for further education. I think both are necessary, however. Peace studies should be a part of the basic education of teachers before they get to teacher training college.

AB: What would be some of the things that you feel are most important to take up with teachers when they come to your course?

RB: One of the first things I do in my course is to ask what their interests are in the subject and then to try and see how much knowledge that they have of some of the substantive issues. Do they know some of the relevant terminology? What are their conceptions of various issues? What needs to be done depends on these starting-points.

It is also very important to communicate to teachers the whole question of how the knowledge for the curricula is selected, organized and transmitted. Where do they have free space to make their own

selection? On what basis do they decide what they'll do, for example, study this topic or that topic? It is essential to get them to reflect on the process of selecting topics. We should help teachers to realize the implications of their choice.

11.

AB: Is there anything else that you would like to add about the school and peace education?

RB: I suppose I'd pick up again the question of special subject or perspective in the curriculum. This is one of the important problems when you are talking about providing resources for teachers. Do we press for a separate subject, if we are producing a year nine kit on peace education? How do we make good handbooks of suggestions? How do we provide ongoing assistance and support for teachers when they do need more information and more help? An important resource for teachers may be a list of people they can ring up. I was shocked in my class last week when I said: If you want to find out more about this area - I have forgotten the particular situation - who would you ask? They all said: Friends or organizations. Not one of them said: I would go to a library. Not one of them said: I would ask someone at the university. This question of assisting teachers to find new ideas relevant to their needs and to fit them into the curricula is really critical.

NOTES ON THE INTERVIEWEE

Robin Burns. Born in Sydney, Australia. Ph.D. 1980, La Trobe University. Senior Lecturer, Centre for Comparative and International Studies, School of Education, La Trobe University. - President, Australian and New Zealand Comparative and International Education Society, 1983-85. Executive Secretary, Peace Education Commission of the International Peace Research Association, 1983-88 and Council Member of IPRA, 1983-88.

Her main professional interests include peace and development education, the roles of women in peace and development work, and theoretical and practical aspects of the cross-cultural transfer of knowledge.

Address: School of Education, La Trobe University, Bundoora, Victoria, 3083 Australia.

Examples of publications

The formation and legitimation of development education with particular reference to Australia and Sweden. (Unpubl. Ph.D. thesis.) Melbourne: La Trobe University, 1979.

Can we educate for disarmament in the present world order? In: Haavelsrud, M. (Ed.) Approaching disarmament education. Guildford, Surrey, Engl.: Westbury House, 1981. Pp. 28-51.

Continuity and change in peace education. Bulletin of Peace Proposals, 1981, 2, 115-123.

Problems of legitimation of peace education. In: Jahn, E. & Sakamoto, Y. (Eds.) Elements of world instability. Frankfurt: Campus Verlag, 1981. Pp. 345-354.

Development education and peace education: From conflict to cooperation. (UNICEF Development Education Paper, No. 22.) New York: UNICEF, 1982.

(With R. Aspeslagh.) Concepts of peace education: A view of Western experience. International Review of Education, 1983, 29, 311-330.

Blinded by the flash: A fairy story for a nuclear age. Gandhi Marg (New Delhi), 1984, 6, 418-432.

(With R. Aspeslagh.) 'Objectivity', values and opinions in the transmission of knowledge for peace. Bulletin of Peace Proposals, 1984, 15, 139-148.

Peace education: Is it responding sufficiently to children's fears of the future? Australian Journal of Early Childhood, 1985, 10(4), 16-23.

Teachers and peace education in Australia: Whose task? In: Alger, C. & Balázs, J. (Eds.) Conflict and crisis of international order. Budapest: Centre for Peace Research Coordination of the Hungarian Academy of Sciences, 1985. Pp. 467-476.

Conflict and mass destruction: A content analysis of Australian involvement in World War II in history textbooks in Victoria. Paper presented for the IPRA Conference, Brighton, Sussex, 1986.

Women, science education and action for peace. In: Alger, C. & Stohl, M. (Eds.) A just peace through transformation. Boulder, CO: Westview Press, 1988. Pp. 190-210.

Morton Deutsch

1.

AB: As an introduction, could you say a few words about yourself and your interest in the field of "peace education"?

MD: Ever since I started in my graduate school training after World War II, after the atomic bombs in Hiroshima and Nagasaki, I was aware of that my work was shadowed by the atomic clouds, so to speak. Even my initial dissertation on cooperation and competition was in part stimulated by the thought that the nations of the world as represented in the Security Council might either cooperate or compete. That thought stimulated me to think about cooperation and competition, about theoretical models of cooperation and competition and to do some experimental work on cooperation and competition in groups. You might say that I turned my interest in issues of war and peace in the international arena to a theoretical investigation of cooperation and competition in a general sense.

After that initial work, I became interested in the conditions which lead to cooperation or competition, what instigates one process or the other. And that led me into a series of research investigations on conflict bargaining or negotiations, where people had a mixture of cooperative and competitive interests, and I was then interested in seeing what would influence whether that mixture would move towards a cooperative or competitive emphasis.

So most of my career has been spent on developing theory and doing research on issues that I think have some fundamental relevance to war and peace and then automatically to peace education. When I was appointed Edward Lee Thorndike Professor, a chair of psychology and education here at Columbia University, in my inaugural address I reviewed my career, and at the end

I indicated that I felt it would be very important for schools of education and the Teachers College to help stimulate the development of cooperative processes in schools, to help children and adults in the schools acquire the attitudes, skills and knowledge for dealing with conflict in a more constructive fashion than is typically the case. I suggested that we should establish an institute or a center here at our College that would stimulate the development of cooperative learning and conflict resolution in the schools.

One of my former students, David Johnson, who is at the University of Minnesota, at the Center of Cooperative Learning, and his brother Roger have been very involved and very active in developing cooperative learning within the schools here in the United States, and I felt that I wanted to further that process. David Johnson's work has been influenced by my own theories and research in this area. By the way, my initial experiment on cooperation and competition was carried out in classrooms; in fact, I created experimental classrooms that were structured so they were to be cooperative or competitive. However, that was an almost accidental feature of my research, since I happened to teach psychology classes at MIT, and using these groups meant a very convenient way for me to do my research.

So we have developed a new Center here at the Teachers College, called The International Center for Cooperation and Conflict Resolution, with the idea of stimulating further development of cooperative learning, conflict resolution and mediation in the schools and the use of constructive controversy in the classrooms. The Johnsons have been heavily involved in the use of constructive controversy.

AB: Is this Center also dealing with teacher education?

MD: Yes. But we are not funded by the College in any way basically. We have outside funding for research. We have a research project currently under way, working

in an inner city high school. This is an alternative high school, in which we are introducing cooperative learning training for the teachers. We provide training in conflict resolution for the teachers, and they are providing that to their students, and we have trained teachers and students in mediation. We are doing some systematic, longitudinal research on the effects of this on the students in terms of their vocational achievement, their educational achievement, their mental health and their social attitudes.

I feel that the key ingredients of any program of peace education are cooperative learning, conflict resolution, mediation, and the use of constructive controversy. In addition, there are of course other elements that have to do with the specific content of international relations which I think is more appropriate for older children, while the core of peace education can in a sense be started from Kindergarten through the kinds of efforts that I mentioned.

So to summarize my answer to your first question, I have always been interested in the issue of peace and war and that has been a constant theme in my intellectual work as a social psychologist, but only in the last few years have I been directly involved in something that relates to peace education, and that is through the Center here. Through the Center we are trying to help develop a core of people who can provide such training to teachers and administrators and also influence our College so that the training of teachers and administrators here moves more in that direction.

2.

AB: What do you think of first when you hear the words "peace education"?

MD: I have mixed feelings, frankly. There is a lot that goes under that broad title that I think is not well thought through and has a kind of general tenderheartedness and soft-mindedness. On the other hand,

I think the values behind it are important and should be supported, and I think that there are essential educational efforts in that area that should be strengthened. Many schools do not provide much constructive social experience for their students, but there are many things they could do.

AB: If you should try to give some kind of definition of peace education that you yourself would be comfortable with, how would you like to formulate it?

MD: Basically I would say that peace education is educating people to learn to live in a cooperative world, to learn to manage the inevitable conflicts that occur in a constructive rather than in a destructive way.

3.

AB: If you think back on your own school days, were there some aspects in your schooling that might be considered an attempt at "peace education"?

MD: I don't think so.

AB: You went to school here in the States?

MD: Yes. There were influences outside of the school, that were probably more in line with these issues. I went to school during the 20s and 30s and graduated from college in 1939, so that's 50 years ago, and at that time there was a concern with war and peace and also with justice, but these concerns were more expressed in my extra-curricular activities than in the school itself.

4.

AB: Do you believe that schools in your country, as you know them today, contribute to a "peace education"?

MD: In general, I would say that they do very little. Most countries, and that is true also of the United States, provide a biased and nationalistic view of the world for example, in their teaching of history, which doesn't provide a good base for collaborative contacts between nations.

AB: When you say "in general", would you indicate that

there are some schools or some parts of the country that are exceptions?

MD: I don't know that there are any parts of the country, but there certainly are individual schools that are exceptions.

5.

AB: Do you think it is at all possible for schools to contribute to a "peace education"? If so, what are some of the steps and measures to be taken that you think of first?

MD: Yes, it is possible. In recent years, it has also been increasingly recognized that our schools have to change in basic ways if we are to educate the children so that they are prepared to live in a peaceful world. In my view, there are four key components in the steps and measures needed: cooperative learning, conflict resolution training, the constructive use of controversy in teaching subject-matters, and the creation of dispute resolution centers in the schools.

AB: What do you consider to be the basic elements in cooperative learning?

MD: The most important is "positive interdependence". Students must perceive that it is to their advantage if other students learn well. This can be achieved in many different ways, for example, by emphasizing mutual goals and by giving joint rewards. Cooperative learning should also involve providing students with the time and procedures for "processing", analyzing how well their groups function and what can be done to improve how they work together.

AB: It is often said that cooperative learning is difficult to arrange and that it does not prepare students for the adult world, which is frequently described as highly competitive. What is your answer to such comments?

MD: Although the concept of cooperative learning is simple, I would agree that its practice is not. Changing a classroom or a school so that cooperative learning is

emphasized is a complex and long-term process, and it requires the teachers to learn many new skills.

That cooperative learning does not prepare for the adult world is often heard, but I would consider that a myth. In fact, the ability of people to work cooperatively is crucial to building and maintaining stable marriages, families, work careers, communities, and a peaceful world. And the issue is not to eliminate competition and individualism but to provide a more appropriate balance with cooperation.

AB: The second key component you mentioned was conflict resolution training. What would be some of the important elements in this training in a school setting?

MD: There are many things that could be mentioned as common elements for most conflict resolution training programs. Let me just give a few examples:

(a) Know what type of conflict you are involved in: the pure win-lose conflict; the mixed-motive (both can win, both can lose, one can win and the other can lose); or the pure cooperative (both can win or both can lose). Different types require different strategies. Many conflicts are misperceived as win-lose conflicts.

(b) Become aware of the consequences of violence and of the alternatives to violence.

(c) Try to distinguish between "interests" and "positions". The classic example is that of a brother and sister, each of whom wanted the only orange available. However, the sister wanted the peel to make marmalade; the brother wanted to eat the inner part. Their positions ("I want the orange") were opposed, their interests were not. When conflicting parties take time to discuss their underlying interests, it may be possible to find a solution which suits them both.

(d) Define the conflicting interests between yourself and the other as a mutual problem to be solved cooperatively. Define the conflict in the "smallest" terms possible, as a "here-now-this" conflict rather than as a conflict between personalities or principles.

(e) In communicating, listen attentively and speak so as to be understood. This requires active attempts to take the perspective of the other and to check continually one's success in doing so.

(f) Be alert to the natural tendencies of both parties to bias, misperceptions, and stereotyped thinking that commonly occur during heated conflict.

(g) Throughout conflict, try to remain a moral person (who is caring and just) and to consider the other as a member of your moral community (entitled to care and justice).

AB: You also mentioned "the constructive use of controversy" in teaching subject-matters. Could you give some concrete example of how this may be applied in the classroom work?

MD: David and Roger Johnson have suggested that this is a technique that can be used in many different school subjects and that it will both promote academic learning and the development of skills relevant to conflict resolution.

This is one way this technique could be used: (1) Assign students to groups of four; (2) divide each group into two pairs with assigned positions on the topic to be discussed; and (3) require each group to reach a consensus on the issue and turn in a group report.

First the paired students learn their respective positions; then, each pair presents its position. Next, there is an open discussion where students try to argue strongly for their positions. After this, there is a perspective-reversal and each pair presents the opposing pair's position as persuasively as they can. In the last phase, they drop their advocacy of assigned positions and seek to reach consensus supported by the evidence.

There is good reason to believe that such structured controversy could not only make the classroom more interesting, but that it would also promote the develop-

ment of perspective taking, critical thinking, and other skills involved in constructive conflict resolution.

6.

AB: What would be some of the possible differences in peace education approaches among younger and older students in schools?

MD: I think there are primary differences. In younger children certainly you want to help develop the basic orientations of cooperation and respect for self and respect for others, which are fundamental to dealing peacefully with others in a constructive manner, even when there are important differences between oneself and the others. And I think that has to be done in terms of the immediate realities for younger children, when the projections in space and in time are not large. As you move up to the older students, for example, in high school, you can get more into substantive issues that are larger in scope than the immediate surroundings.

7.

AB: If you were an upper-secondary school teacher in a subject with which you are particularly familiar, how would you like to make the students more conscious of and more prepared for problems of peace, within that subject?

MD: If you take any subject, first of all you can teach it in a way that uses the technique that I mentioned earlier, that of structured constructive controversy. You stimulate controversy as part of the subject matter under certain rules, which help teach the students that they can have intellectual differences and can engage in a lively controversy that is productive, where the interest of self and the other merge in a constructive way rather than in an oppositional way.

Life is full of conflict, so any subject matter has a lot of conflict in it, such as English literature. You can analyze the processes involved in dramatic

fiction, and you can help enrich people's understanding of conflict and help them to understand what are the conditions which lead to a more constructive form of conflict handling. That can be done in history; any subject matter can be used for that purpose, even science. I think it takes a little imagination, but with that imagination you can find in any subject matter material that can be very relevant.

AB: Would there be some particular results from social psychology relevant to peace education that you feel would be especially important to take up with high school students?

MD: There are many aspects of social psychology that would be relevant. My general view is, however, that you can help students by teaching particular subject courses dealing with conflict, for example - that is useful. But my emphasis would be on the functioning of a school. The school has to become a collaborative institution as experienced by people in their day-to-day function as students and teachers. The ways of working together, the ways of dealing with conflicts are very important and may contradict the verbal message included in a course.

8.

AB: In international debates, the terms "disarmament education" and "peace education" have been used, in addition to some other related terms ("global education", "education for international understanding" etc.). Do you have any comments and preferences as to this terminology?

MD: I don't like any of them, particularly. Disarmament or arms control or whatever you want to call it is just a particular aspect of a more general process that I have been describing. It requires becoming well informed about particular technical issues. I think that is valuable, but I don't think that is the essence. The essence is what I have been describing.

AB: When you say you don't like any of these terms particularly - what term would you prefer to use when describing this area?

MD: I am not sure. I haven't given any particular thoughts to terminology. It is really the emphasis that is important. For me it is central to help people learn how to work together as individuals and as groups, as organizations and as nations and help people learn how to deal with the inevitable conflicts that are going to occur at all levels of individual and social life, including international life. For particular areas you are going to have to learn about cultural ethnic and racial differences. In other areas you are going to have to learn about trade and economic issues. The content of the issues of conflict and collaboration vary enormously, but the generalities are the things I've mentioned.

9.

AB: In many countries, questions related to disarmament and peace are highly controversial. Would you anticipate any difficulties, for example with parents or other members of the community, when introducing peace education in schools? If so, what kind of difficulties? Do you see any way out of such problems?

MD: There are a number of political problems that sometimes arise. Right-wing people, particularly the radical right in the U.S., have tried to identify concern with peace and peace education with a left-wing position; it has been considered "bad", "communism" and so on. So you have that problem. I think that the way you deal with that problem is to talk about the fact that teamwork, cooperation in community, family life and so on are essential and long established traditions in American culture. For individuals to be able to succeed and for groups and corporations to be able to succeed, they have to have considerable skills in cooperation and know how to manage conflict, and that's

one of the key points.

AB: Would you consider disarmament education as part of peace education, and would that perhaps be particularly difficult to handle in school?

MD: My conception of peace education would be that disarmament education is one part dealing with the discussion of the issues involved in disarmament, arms control, military weapons - all of those complicated issues. This part does not belong in the elementary schools in my view. It involves a higher level of sophistication and special knowledge of many issues, knowledge of physics, international relations and legal processes.

10.

AB: What needs to be done in teacher training in order to prepare future teachers more adequately for the area of "peace education"?

MD: I think there is much more than teacher training involved, but I do think that teacher training is important. I think what is involved is a basic restructuring of the way in which schools function. They have to become more collaborative institutions. Most schools, in the United States anyway, are not such institutions, and the people within them, teachers and administrators, are not adequately prepared to function that way, so you need to think about how teachers and administrators can learn to work together so that school is a collaborative institution. This is an important task for teacher education and in-service training. As I indicated earlier, changing a classroom so that it emphasizes cooperative learning requires the teachers to learn many skills, for example: ways of teaching students cooperative skills; how to monitor and intervene in the student work-groups to improve students' collaborative skills; methods of composing student groups and structuring learning goals so the groups are likely to work well together; how to develop curriculum materials to promote positive interdependence;

how to create academic controversies within the cooperative groups; and ways of integrating the cooperative learning with competitive and individualistic learning activities.

AB: Do you think that this kind of teacher training is a reality at present in this country?

MD: No, it's definitely not. There are a number of institutes training people in cooperative learning, but the groups involved are small. Many of these people are isolated and their training doesn't get applied.

11.

AB: In many schools, the students represent a variety of nationalities and cultural backgrounds. To what extent would it be possible to use this fact as an aid in education for peace? Would you expect some difficulties in doing so?

MD: I think that is a very important and valuable asset to such education. Like in cooperative learning you ought to have heterogeneous groups, and the opportunity to have children of different ethnic and cultural backgrounds or even children who are physically different work collaboratively and learn together provides a very fine opportunity to develop positive attitudes and mutual understanding. In conflict resolution courses, there is an emphasis on the ability to deal with different ways of perceiving reality and different culture values and then on understanding how such differences can lead to conflict and misunderstanding. The presence of a variety of backgrounds can enrich the whole process of education in these areas.

AB: Do you see any special difficulties in this work?

MD: There are some stereotypes that do exist. For example, in white middle class families, parents are often afraid when their children are in the same schools as black inner-city kids: they can be exposed to drugs and other harmful influences, or they are going to be held back because of poor educational attainment, and

I think you often have to deal with those issues with parents. However, children often, and with teachers who are sophisticated, learn more, they learn about aspects of life that they are not otherwise exposed to.

12.

AB: Sometimes the term "global survival" is used to refer to an area dealing both with the risks of nuclear war and with the risks of far-reaching environmental damage through pollution and overuse of resources. How do you look upon dealing with these two categories of risks together in school? Do you have any suggestions as to how the teacher could approach the problem area of environmental damage?

MD: Yes, I think it is very relevant to deal with these areas together. There are problems that everyone has to face - some of them have to deal with threat of war, some of them with damage to the environment, and they both involve our ability to survive on this planet. In addition, if environmental issues are to be dealt with in any constructive way, people, groups, nations are going to have to learn how to collaborate effectively, and they are going to have to learn how to deal with important conflicts of interest. We need constructive resolutions of those conflicts rather than use of force or other destructive means.

A good deal of my own research in the area of conflict resolution started off with the prisoner's dilemma game, which is very relevant to these problems. Individuals feel they have more to gain by polluting than by trying to prevent pollution, but when everybody has that attitude we destroy the common good. When you deal with those kinds of dilemmas you need to develop the orientations that lead to cooperation and mutual problem solving rather than attempts to gain a particularly advantage for self.

13.

AB: Is there anything else that you would like to add about the school and peace education?

MD: I don't think there is a general recognition in society, not even among educators and scientists, how important this general area is to the future. I think our global problems can become radically worse in a relatively short time, so that we don't have a great deal of time to prepare ourselves. One of the reasons I have become interested in this general area was a feeling that there is more hope so to speak in transforming attitudes if you start early, while it's sometimes a little difficult when you are dealing with the heads of government to try to produce those transformations. Their attitudes were strongly formed many years ago.

If our children can learn to think in new ways as Einstein suggested, then we maybe will be able to survive the existence of nuclear weapons and all the threats to our environment. If that new way of thinking is not developed, I am not sure that our children will be able to survive.

NOTES ON THE INTERVIEWEE

When Morton Deutsch was given the award for distinguished scientific contributions by the American Psychological Association in 1987, the American Psychologist published a condensed description of his career (1988, p. 222 ff.). We have here borrowed a number of formulations from that description; and the interested reader could find more information in that article.

Morton Deutsch was born in New York City, in 1920, and entered the City College of New York at the early age of 15. While at college, he was immersed in a student culture that highly valued Marx, Freud, scientific method, and political activism; and he conducted his first laboratory experiment (a variation on Sherif's study of social norms).

After City College, he started graduate work in clinical psychology, obtaining a MA at the University of Pennsylvania. His war experiences shifted his psychological interests toward social psychology. This shift was reinforced by an interview with Kurt Lewin, in which Lewin described his plans for the Research Center for Group Dynamics at the Massachusetts Institute of Technology (MIT).

At MIT, Deutsch became part of a creative, innovative group that would mold the development of social psychology for several decades. The faculty included Dorwin Cartwright, Leon Festinger and Ronald Lippitt. Deutsch turned his concerns about the possibility of a nuclear war arising from international competition into a theoretical and experimental investigation of the effects of cooperation and competition. This classic study, in addition to being the take-off point for much of Deutsch's subsequent work, has helped to stimulate the development of a movement toward cooperative learning in the schools under the leadership of David and Roger Johnson.

In 1948, Deutsch joined the Research Center for Human Relations headed by Stuart Cook (at the New School and then New York University). There, Deutsch worked with colleagues on studies of intergroup prejudice and dis-

crimination as well as on factors affecting the initiation of cooperation.

In 1956, Carl Hovland persuaded Deutsch to join and establish a new research group in psychology at the Bell Telephone Laboratories. There, he did research on small group processes and interpersonal bargaining. He was also the "peacenik" at the Bell Labs, criticizing the strategic thinking current among established intellectuals, and co-editing a book on "Preventing Nuclear War III".

In 1963, Deutsch accepted an invitation to establish a new social psychology doctoral program at Teachers College, Columbia University. With the help of many able students, Deutsch engaged in extensive theorizing and research on conflict resolution and distributive justice. This important work is summarized in "The Resolution of Conflict" and "Distributive Justice". Deutsch and his students are continuing to do research on cooperation, conflict, and justice.

Examples of publications

A theory of cooperation and competition. Human Relations, 1949, 2, 129-151.

An experimental study of the effects of cooperation and competition upon group process. Human Relations, 1949, 2, 199-231.

Field theory in social psychology. In: Lindzey, G. & Aronson, E. (Eds.) The handbook of social psychology. (Vol. 1.) Reading, MA: Addison, Wesley, 1968. Pp. 412-487.

Conflicts: Productive and destructive. Journal of Social Issues, 1969, 25, 7-41.

The resolution of conflict: Constructive and destructive processes. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 1973.

Fifty years of conflict. In: Festinger, L. (Ed.) Retrospections on social psychology. New York: Oxford University Press, 1980. Pp. 46-77.

Interdependence and psychological orientation. In: Derlega, V. & Grzelek, J.L. (Eds.) Cooperation and helping behavior. New York: Academic Press, 1982. Pp. 15-42.

Distributive justice: A social-psychological perspective. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 1985.

- Experimental studies of the effects of different systems of distributive justice. In: Masters, J.C. & Smith, W.P. (Eds.) Social comparison, social justice, and relative deprivation. Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum, 1987. Pp. 151-164.
- (With M. Jahoda and S.W. Cook.) Research methods in social relations. New York: Holt-Dryden, 1951.
- (With Q. Wright and W.M. Evan, Eds.) Preventing World War III: Some proposals. New York: Simon and Schuster, 1962.

1.

AB: As an introduction, could you say a few words about yourself and your interest in the field of "peace education"?

VFC: I am with the World Council for Curriculum and Instruction (WCCI) as member of the executive committee, national coordinator of the Philippines Chapter, and also the editor-in-chief of the FORUM, the official journal of the World Council. I first got involved in peace education in 1983 when I was invited by Betty Reardon to participate in the Second IIPE (International Institute for Peace Education) in Teachers College at Columbia University. I was there as a participant in 1983. She invited me the following year to lead a workshop in peace education for the secondary school level.

My initial interest and involvement was not specifically on peace education. I was working on values education as far back as 1981 when we started writing instructional programs for social responsibility in our school. Later I realized that values education and peace education address similar concerns: peace values are some of the agenda that are included in our values education program. That's how my work on peace education and values education come to interface with each other. Right now, my work is focused on arranging seminars and workshops for teachers, for them to be able to integrate peace values in their respective subjects.

AB: Are you at a teacher training school?

VFC: I am not officially connected to any teacher training school. In my country, several officers and members of the WCCI are commissioned by the Department of Education and Culture to take care of the values education component of the orientation program of teachers for the new elementary curriculum. So that's

how I am involved: We are national trainers and we prepare training modules as well as conduct training for regional trainers.

AB: Have you been a classroom teacher?

VFC: Yes, I was a classroom teacher for 10 years before I became a principal. Then I was connected with a teacher training school and later with a graduate school for educational management. Right now I am not connected officially with any of the training institutions but with the publishing industry. I am in charge of the research and planning department of one of the biggest textbook publishing houses in my country. But my professional organization is the WCCI and that's where I am fully involved in peace education.

2.

AB: What do you think of first when you hear the words "peace education"?

VFC: First, in 1983, my idea of peace education was primarily nuclear disarmament education for the elimination of war and all kinds of conflicts on a global level. But now when I think of peace education I am thinking more of the lives of the people - the poor people. I am thinking more of social justice, the violation of human rights, the oppression, the destruction of the environment and all kinds of injustices. Ironically, it's the opposite of peace. When I think of peace education, I am thinking of how we can educate our people so that all these forms of injustices can be eliminated.

AB: Do you think of peace education as dealing primarily with information and knowledge or do you also include attitudes and values? That is, what would you include as goals or objectives for the peace education?

VFC: I would look at peace education in relation to three dimensions in the development of a person and society. First, we need basic information, we have to have knowledge; otherwise we will not be able to think

rationally and make rational decisions. In addition to providing information, peace education should be able to develop the skill of rational thinking, critical thinking. But that is not enough. I think attitudes and values should also be reoriented towards the development of a more peaceful environment and a more peaceful community. So peace education for me should include knowledge, information, reason, as well as the capacity and inclination to care and to have concern for others.

AB: Do you also want to include an aspect of preparation for action in peace education?

VFC: Oh, yes. Peace education should address two questions related to attitudes and values. One is: What are these attitudes and values that we should develop? And the second is: What should we do to be able to translate these attitudes and values into critical action? For me peace education would be merely an academic exercise if it does not motivate people to commit themselves to social action.

AB: Could you give examples of what you primarily think of when talking about values?

VFC: In our work in the Philippines we have identified and redefined some core values which we might call our shared values, namely: social responsibility, economic self-sufficiency, respect for human rights, cultural solidarity, environmental care, and a deep sense of spirituality. In peace education and values education, these are the values that we feel are necessary. They are universal, but in terms of their application there might be differences between countries or cultural areas.

3.

AB: If you think back on your own school days, were there some aspects in your schooling that might be considered an attempt at "peace education"?

VFC: Private sectarian schools offered religious education which was intended not only to catechize or evangelize but also to provide moral education for the schoolchildren. There were also other activities called character education in the lower levels and ethics in the tertiary. All these were intended to make the school youth peaceful and peace loving. But because the teaching was dogmatic and non-participative, the methods were rather unpeaceful, quite contrary to the pedagogy for peace education.

AB: You went to school in the Philippines?

VFC: Yes. I went to both public and private schools but most of the time in Catholic schools run by religious priests and nuns.

4.

AB: Do you believe that schools in your country, as you know them today, contribute to a "peace education"?

VFC: It's difficult to generalize, but a good majority of our schools are still very traditional in their method of teaching. However there are some that are slowly being awakened to a new approach to education. Since my job brings me all over the country, I know that there are many creative teachers who are now shifting to a more cooperative, participative approach in their teaching-learning methods, a development I try to contribute to through our peace education workshops. Many schools have also reoriented their mission to become more responsive to societal issues.

5.

AB: Do you think it is at all possible for schools to contribute to a "peace education"? If so, what are some of the steps and measures to be taken that you think of first?

VFC: I think it is possible and desirable. In fact, peace education should start in the schools if the homes do not take the initiative. As educators we should take it upon ourselves as our primary responsibility to

educate for peace. As an initial step we should take stock of the curriculum, go over and reflect on each part of the curriculum: Are the agenda of the curriculum peaceful? Are they conducive to the creation of a peaceful mind? Administrators and faculty should look at the atmosphere and the existing structures in their schools: What kind of structures are apparent in the school? Are they affirming the dignity of the learner, of the individual, or are they contributing to oppressive systems and relationships?

AB: When you think more of the methods in the classroom, what methods would be especially conducive to peace education?

VFC: In terms of methodology in the classroom, teachers should no longer go to the classroom and pose as experts or authorities. Teachers could now start to look at education as a form of dialogue with open discussions and critical reflections, so that there will be a plurality of views, not only what the teacher imposes on the students; that's one point.

Another consideration is for teachers not to put too much emphasis on competition. I have been trying to call the attention of our teachers that most of their motivations are very competitive: "Who has the best paper?", "Who will finish first?", "Who accumulates the greatest number of points?" These are all very aggressive and they don't encourage the spirit of cooperation. If you build up competition in the classroom, you train students to become aggressors. These are some thoughts we could consider.

6.

AB: What would be some of the possible differences in peace education approaches among younger and older students in schools?

VFC: Younger students might still be responsive to some kind of inculcation method which will no longer be acceptable to older students. Role modeling which is

very effective for children may be seen as a kind of inculcation but adults and older students are much more discerning. Both young and old have to be given chances for more critical thinking and reflection. For the younger kids, a simple activity for consciousness-raising can be a start off. For the older ones, simulation games might be more effective; in these kinds of activities the learners put themselves in the peace or conflict situation and act out the resolution of the conflict according to their interpretation of events and the dynamics of relationship that will surface during the simulation. For both younger and older children the experiential approaches are very effective, that is, allowing them to run through real life-situations or a close simulation of such a situation.

7.

AB: If you were an upper-secondary school teacher in a subject with which you are particularly familiar, how would you like to make the students more conscious of and more prepared for problems of peace, within that subject?

VFC: As a secondary school teacher, my area of specialization was mathematics and biology. In mathematics I would approach integration of peace concepts in graphical representations of, for example, the nuclear arms race. How many billions of dollars are spent annually on arms build-up, what does this mean when converted to development programs? Graphical representation can be a technique for making the students aware of the facts which will lead them to ask some ethical questions about their country's priorities. Then in word problems I don't use the problems that are in the standard books, like if this train travels at a certain speed and another travels at another speed, when do they collide, and so on. I make my own word problems and usually, I use situations in our country like demonstrating that 10 percent of the people own

90 percent of the land, showing them economic and social inequalities using mathematical problems. In English and communication arts it is relatively easy to introduce peace concepts. For example, when our objective is listening skills or writing skills, we just choose poems of protest or songs of peace and use them as the medium or springboard. Thus, we try to integrate peace perspectives with various skills training in school.

8.

AB: In international debates, the terms "disarmament education" and "peace education" have been used in addition to some other related terms ("global education", "education for international understanding" etc.). Do you have any comments and preferences as to this terminology?

VFC: A colleague of mine, Dr. Toh Swee-Hin, also a WCCI Board member, had several occasions to visit Philippine schools, observe the rural conditions and live with the people and together we developed a framework for peace education in the Philippines. In this framework we suggested that several peace and conflict issues need to be analyzed namely: militarism, human rights, structural violence, environmental care, cultural solidarity and personal peace. Thus, within this framework, "disarmament education" is only one of the components of peace education when we discuss militarism. "International understanding" is one of the goals we want to achieve that is why we have peace education. And "global education" would be dealt with in the concept of cultural solidarity, environmental care and structural violence. Furthermore, as I said earlier, peace education is a holistic concept concerned not only with content but equally attentive to peaceful methodology.

9.

AB: In many countries, questions related to disarmament and peace are highly controversial. Would you expect some difficulties for example with parents or other members of the community when introducing peace education in schools? If so, what kind of difficulties? Do you see any way out of such problems?

VFC: In our country, peace education came much later than the peace movement groups. Peace education and the peace educators are a well respected group in our academic community, so we have not had any difficulty so far. In that respect we have been very fortunate which helps to catalyze the spread of education and action for peace. A controversy right now is that our Department of Education has issued an executive order making values education a priority, and many of the administrators and teachers feel that bringing in values education is another of those impositions or prescriptions from above. Some peace educators feel that peace education should be emphasized more rather than a broad unfocused values education program. But I think that since values education covers a wide range of universal values, there should be no conflict between peace education and values education.

AB: So there haven't been any problems with parents or community members, which is the case in some countries, where peace education is felt to be very controversial?

VFC: No, none that I know of. It is probably because peace in the Philippines is a national vision - one that unifies our people. Of course there are major differences in our means but in the schools, educating for peace is seen not only as a curricular innovation but a necessity to our survival.

10.

AB: What needs to be done in teacher training in order to prepare future teachers more adequately for the area of "peace education"?

VFC: In teacher training there should be a focus both on content and on principles and methods of teaching. In our country we have included, for example, two new subjects in the Teacher Training Curriculum - Social Ethics I and II which deal with the concept of valuing and moral decisions.

AB: This is in basic teacher training?

VFC: Yes. I also recommend that in the enrichment of the principles and methods of teaching, a focus should be on new methodologies which include the more participative and more peaceful techniques of teaching. Creative teaching-learning activities should be introduced in the teacher training program. Courses in conflict resolution, active non-violence, negotiations and consensus should be introduced.

In our country there is a move now to offer at least three units of peace education as one of the subjects in teacher education. Peace education is also being offered as an elective in the liberal arts courses. At least one university offers Peace Education as an area of specialization in the graduate program of education.

AB: And what about in-service training - is there a need for peace education there too?

VFC: All the more, I think, there is a need for peace education in in-service trainings. Teachers who graduated from the universities a long time ago need to be informed, updated, and made aware of the things that are developing in terms of methodology. That's what I am involved in now - workshops and seminars for in-service training - not pre-service.

AB: What kind of workshop or courses do you give then - what is the time range?

VFC: There are various kinds. It could range from a one-day seminar to an 11-day 3-unit credit course.

AB: Can you explain that?

VFC: When teachers go for training, it is either non-credit or for credit. An 11-day training is usually a

credit course where there are universities that credit it towards a graduate degree. This introductory course presents the six major peace and conflict issues that I enumerated earlier and then a series of pedagogical principles are discussed, demonstrated, and practiced. But not all teachers and not all schools are able to give time enough for this course span, so sometimes we do it only in one day or two days.

AB: When you talked about 11 days, would they be in one block or would they be spread out?

VFC: One block, and usually we give it in the summer-time; this is the regular time for teachers to go for advance graduate classes or other type of in-service training.

11.

AB: Is there anything else that you would like to add about the school and peace education?

VFC: In order for peace education to take off the ground, the climate of the school itself must be open and must reflect peaceful values and peaceful methodologies. If the morale of the faculty and other members of the staff is very low, efforts for peace education could be undermined. If there is no trust and rapport between and among the administrators, teachers, parents and students; if there is no way in which members of the school community can reach out to each other, it is also difficult to introduce peace education. So I would say that for peace education to succeed in any school, the total environment, the structures and relationships must be based on justice, cooperation, and compassion. And finally, the school must be an integral part of the total community and as such it doesn't operate in isolation, it addresses societal concerns and problems and the curriculum must deal directly with the life experiences of the learners.

NOTES ON THE INTERVIEWEE

Virginia Floresca-Cawagas is Vice President for Planning and Development of Phoenix Publishing House, the national coordinator of the World Council for Curriculum and Instruction, WCCI-Philippines and former executive secretary of the Catholic Educational Association of the Philippines (CEAP).

Before assuming the executive position at the CEAP, she was a classroom teacher, a high school principal, a college instructor, and a faculty member of the Educational Management Center of De La Salle University. In 1980 to 1983 she was with La Salle Green Hills as research director where she worked as project coordinator and editor of various Values Integration Modules of La-Salle Green Hills. She was a member of the DECS Values Education Task Force organized by Sec. Quisumbing upon her assumption as Secretary of Education in 1986. She was also in the research team that prepared the study of the State of the Practice of Values Education in the Philippines by Undersecretary Sutaria presented to the Southeast Asian Research Advisory Group. She is at present pursuing a doctoral program in Peace and Development Education.

She has presented papers and served as a resource person in Values Education and Peace Education in various international fora in Australia, Germany, USA, Canada and Japan. She has also gone around the country like Baguio, Isabela, La Union, Sorsogon, Cebu, Ozamis, Surigao, Cotabato, and Iligan conducting workshops both in Values and Peace Education.

She is at present the Editor-in-chief of the WCCI FORUM, the official journal of WCCI, a member of the Advisory Board of TAGSIBOL, the DAP Values Education Magazine, and a member of the Advisory Board of DAMAY LIKHA.

She has authored, co-authored, or coordinated the writing of Civics and Culture Series, the Values Education Series for the New Secondary Curriculum, a Sourcebook of Strategies for Values Education, and a Framework for

Peace Education, a book distributed worldwide.

As a member of the Board of Directors of the World Council for Curriculum and Instruction (WCCI), she works closely with educators worldwide who, like her, are involved in peace education, global education and values education.

Address: Virginia Floresca-Cawagas, Phoenix Publishing House, 937 Quezon Avenue, Quezon City, Philippines.

Søren Keldorff

1.

AB: As an introduction, could you say a few words about yourself and your interest in the field of "peace education"?

SK: I am a trained psychologist (1975) and have been teaching psychology and education at university level since then. I've also done research in these areas and written books about family psychology, educational psychology and the history of psychology. During the last five years I have increasingly oriented my teaching and research towards the psychology and pedagogics of peace, and I have succeeded in introducing elements of these areas into the first two years of the study of social sciences at the University of Aalborg. I have also taught these subjects in adult education evening classes.

In collaboration with Professor Pauli Jensen at the Danish School of Educational Studies in Copenhagen I have edited one of the first Danish books - an anthology - about peace education ("Peace Education - the Psychology and Pedagogics of Working for Peace". Copenhagen: Gyldendal, 1984).

Finally I might mention that I have been working lately in a project associated with the new centre for peace and conflict research in Copenhagen. This is a project dealing with young people's and adults' perceptions of the relations between the East and the West and their fear of nuclear war.

AB: Could you say a little more about these studies? What is it in particular that you are interested in studying, and is it possible to say something about the result?

SK: There have been quite a number of studies that show that people worry a lot about the arms race of the superpowers and about nuclear war. As a matter of fact, WHO has pointed to this anxiety as being one of the greatest health risks of the 80s. My colleague Professor Pauli Jensen and some Danish doctors who are against nuclear weapons have made a Danish counterpart

of the international Goldenring-Doctor investigation. The Danish study shows that more than 80 % of some 1,200 schoolchildren studied in Copenhagen worry about nuclear war every day.

I myself have taken a slightly different direction in my research and teaching about peace. A couple of years ago, in Yugoslavia, I met some American Quakers and peace activists who taught me to work with "workshops of the future". The reason why I'm using this work method now - much more so than the lectures I used to go on tour with - is that, in my opinion, it's becoming increasingly essential to motivate people to act in a positive way with a more peaceful future in view. For when you lecture on all the gloomy prospects of the arms race and the danger of war, there's a risk that you might help people repress all those terrible things because they simply cannot stand thinking about them. By using the "workshops of the future", you take a different approach - pedagogically - and mobilise people's imagination and their desires for changes in the world.

AB: Can you explain briefly what this method involves?

SK: The technique is really quite simple. First you try to make the participants relax. Then you ask them to recall a particular situation in their childhood when they felt safe. Against that background they then visualize or imagine a peaceful society - 30 years into the future. When their conceptions of this peaceful society have become fairly clear, you ask them to "remember" how it was created. And then you have to go back from their conceptions to our current reality in order to conceive new ideas leading to concrete action.

AB: Do you think that your "workshops" function well?

SK: Yes, surprisingly well, if I may say so myself. People have many creative ideas for a better future. And I think the most fantastic thing is that there is no major age difference: 18-year-olds and pensioners are equally animated when it comes to creating conceptions

of a different and better future - a future without violence, social injustice and militarism.

AB: Could you say something about what this imagined peaceful society usually looks like?

SK: In relation to today's society, there are changes in at least three dimensions. These three dimensions concern the relationships individual - work, individual - individual and individual - nature.

To put it very briefly: in the future that people envisage, the time frame for obligatory work has been drastically reduced. People often imagine small, self-governing units that are responsible for housing and their own production of necessities. Child rearing and child minding are taken care of locally, since there are always elderly people with plenty of time and experience who can look after the children - and then, of course, there are the animals, who also play an important role in many of my informants' visions of the future. On the whole, there is great respect for everything that's alive. Naturally this also applies to the environment; people want to reestablish a natural and sensitive relationship with nature - an ecological co-existence and protection.

AB: Do you see any connection between the results of the "workshop method" and the studies about school children's anxiety that you mentioned earlier?

SK: Yes, definitely. The wide spectrum of worries about the future of the world that appeared in the studies of school children between 12 and 17 reemerges to a large extent among the young people and adults when they try to find solutions in the "workshops of the future": rearmament, danger of war, violence in everyday life, starvation in the world, unemployment, insecurity and alienation in the social network, etc.

In my opinion, what we are dealing with here is nothing less than a gigantic, latent need for a change of reality that neither the educational system nor the political parties seem to perceive or understand because it is so radical.

2.

AB: This naturally leads over to the next question: What do you think of first when you hear the words "peace education"?

SK: Well, I suppose I think about it in a complex way, just as I've already tried to talk about it. And I might add here that these problems haven't become less complex just because I have been working with them for the last 5 or 6 years.

In my opinion, it's a question of finding suitable ways of creating a new kind of responsibility towards human beings, nature and our green globe, so that all kinds of manifest and concealed (structural) violence are counteracted and so that the individual is made responsible for himself or herself, as well as for this totality, in cooperation with other people across sexual, cultural, national and racial borderlines. The final goal is a global responsibility or a global ethics concentrating on ecological as well as peace-oriented issues. There are many stages in this process, and they should be constructed in different ways depending on the particular inter-human and pedagogical contexts that apply. In order to indicate the extremes, it may concern anything from getting enthusiastic about the many magnificent colours displayed by a butterfly or a sunset at sea to - as I mentioned in connection with the "workshops of the future" - creative, half-therapeutic attempts to envisage, via "travels in imagination", a world without elements of violence and destruction that are created by human beings.

3.

AB: If you think back on your own school days, were there some aspects in your schooling that might be considered an attempt at "peace education"?

SK: What comes first to mind when I think about my own school days is a geography teacher (a previous member of Haslund Christensen's expedition to Afghanistan)

who opened our eyes to the values in other cultures' lifestyles by his lively way of telling stories. But apart from that, it was war and the supremacy of the Western culture that were the dominant subjects.

4.

AB: Do you believe that schools in your country, as you know them today, contribute to a "peace education"?

SK: What takes place at school in this area at the present time is too scattered and temporary. It is too dependent on the individual teachers' personal interest - and, not least, whether they have the professional courage to deal with it in their teaching. Unfortunately, there is still a tendency to see these issues as strongly left-wing matters, even though - as may be seen in, for example, the studies I've already mentioned - they are one of the most generally human problems that you can tackle pedagogically today.

AB: Do you know if there have been any attempts at charting peace education in Denmark? As far as I know, Denmark has no central directives about peace education (as opposed to Finland, Norway and Sweden). Do you think that such directives should be introduced?

SK: As far as I know, all attempts at charting and creating teaching materials for this area at school are private - maybe with the exception of the very poor indoctrinating materials published by the Danish Defense Department. It's really absurd and paradoxical that it should be private grassroot movements who pay for the preparation and duplication of what you might call the most essential teaching materials in the school of the 90s!

On the other hand, I would like to add that it may, after all, be a good thing - at present - that we don't have directives about peace education from the Ministry of Education in the Danish school, since I suspect that they would be very similar to the series published by the Defense Department in their attempts to accommodate the highly diverging opinions of the various

political parties. That's why I'm not much inclined to go in for central directives for peace education at the moment - not as long as Denmark has a markedly bourgeois government that is apt to speak with the voice of NATO.

5.

AB: Do you think it is at all possible for schools to contribute to a "peace education"? If so, what are some of the steps and measures to be taken that you think of first?

SK: Yes, I do think it's possible, and I think that cross-cultural studies are a good way to start, particularly teaching about the developing countries in the third world. The students have been prepared for this kind of teaching by watching TV, and things like starvation, soil erosion, the devastation of the rain forest, the extermination of animal species, the lack of pure drinking water etcetera are very obvious to them. It's also fairly easy to see that rearmament and investment in the death machines of Western culture counteract the possibility of coming to terms with these negative trends of development.

On the other hand, I don't think it's advisable to start with the atom bomb, an imminent third world war between the two superpowers, the Danish defense or NATO. Those things tend to cause too much anxiety, and they counteract motivation, since there is very little the individual pupil can do here, especially in the school environment. But I do think that once you have laid a solid foundation consisting of cross-cultural studies and learning about the developing countries, you can proceed to the military problems in our own culture.

AB: Could you say something more about teaching materials in this area in Denmark?

SK: There are excellent teaching materials about the developing countries. What is eminently lacking is a holistic view that links the problems in the third

world with, for example, the Western model of government and militarism that is in the process of impoverishing the third world just now. The gigantic foreign debts of these countries have mainly been caused by investing in a defense and security model that even we - the richest countries in the world - can no longer afford.

There is a frightening lack of teaching materials of this kind that gather the perspectives together into a holistic view. And it takes a lot of professional courage and sleepless nights for the individual teacher to be able to construct, and to teach according to, such a holistic view.

6.

AB: What would be some of the possible differences in peace education approaches among younger and older students in schools?

SK: As far as both older and younger students are concerned, I think it's wise to start working with the problems by teaching them about the developing countries. But, of course, there are more possibilities of approaching the agonizing issues of an imminent nuclear war with the older students.

AB: In Sweden, peace education has been criticized on those very grounds, i.e. that it might have a frightening effect. Has this kind of criticism occurred in Denmark as well, and how do you personally look at this problem?

SK: I think I have already mentioned that I don't really believe you can achieve very much by frightening people. With his customary knack of shocking the idealistic bourgeoisie, Jan Øberg has called this tendency "nuclear-war pornography". The "workshops of the future" that I described earlier take a different, and more positive, psychological approach - the clearly universal human incentives for hope and action. I'm not an expert on small children and the elementary school, but it seems to me that there is a considerable difference between saying - as Bertel Haarder, our Minister of Education,

did - "It's a pity to frighten children by talking about nuclear war" and thinking along the following lines: The realities behind the armament situation of the superpowers don't look very bright. But the world has been recreated over and over again, when people have worked actively and energetically to bring about a change. Take, for example, the abolition of illiteracy in large parts of the world, the abolition of slavery, the abolition of "stavnsbåndet" (a temporary Danish law prohibiting Danish peasants from leaving their place of birth), the increasing political equality of previously oppressed groups, such as black people, women etc.

7.

AB: If you were an upper-secondary school teacher in a subject with which you are particularly familiar, how would you like to make the students more conscious of and more prepared for problems of peace, within that subject?

SK: Even though psychology is not a special subject in the curriculum of the Danish upper-secondary school, the perspectives of peace psychology are good starting-points since the students are able to understand immediately that feelings, concepts and awareness are important. It's a question of progressing from anxiety towards action. You may start with the proposition that myths stand between us and reality, and that those who control the myths are blocking our possibilities of handling our security in a satisfactory way. You should discuss the content of the myths, e.g. prejudice, xenophobia, enemy images and disinformation.

It is important to come to terms with the myth of aggression - human beings are not born evil; it's a matter of learning. Violence and destructive behaviour are acquired and can, in principle, be unlearned. It is also important to point to the structural conditions of our culture - militarism, neoimperialism etc. -

as explanations of violence and armament in the world. In the course of history, mankind has been able to get rid of illiteracy and slavery. Consequently, we should be able to abolish war and violence as well. (Jan Øberg in Lund has inspired much of my thinking about these matters.)

8.

AB: In international debates, the terms "disarmament education" and "peace education" have been used, in addition to some other related terms ("global education", "education for international understanding" etc.). Do you have any comments and preferences as to this terminology?

SK: Yes, first of all I have a pragmatic attitude to terms in general: that you should take great pains to try to find the expressions that correspond best to what teachers and students actually say. As you know, language is a living thing in a constant state of change, and it could very well be that none of the terms mentioned above is quite appropriate. Why not "knowledge of the world", for example? When I was at school 25 years ago, social studies had just been introduced as a subject. The transition from "the society" to "the world" illustrates quite well what we are talking about, I think. In those days, talking about "social studies" meant an enormous expansion of school activities. Today, however, we cannot limit ourselves to that area but must adopt the global perspective.

AB: In Sweden it has been discussed whether this area should be called "fredsfostran" ("training for peace") or "fredsundervisning" ("peace instruction"). Swedish-speaking Finns like to talk about "fredsfostran", while the Swedish Board of Education now prefers the term "fredsundervisning". Has there been a similar discussion in Denmark? And what is your own attitude to this?

SK: The word "opdragelse" sounds a bit old-fashioned in Danish, since it makes you think about good order and discipline. Since people on both the right and the left of the political spectrum associate it with the word "compulsion", it cannot be used for that reason alone. The word "undervisning" is more neutral in Danish and is probably a happier choice.

But once I have said this, I would like to claim that, fundamentally, what we are talking about is "uppfostran" - in the sense that we are faced with the necessity of reintroducing ethical or moral issues into our teaching. It is no longer sufficient to talk about "general subjects", where the students, by means of the philosophy of the Age of Enlightenment and a democratic way of thinking, are supposed to be made conscious of a foundation that will enable them to make their own choice. Historically, we have arrived at an intersection where the freedom to choose, for example, to continue recklessly overexploiting nature, or to heedlessly push technological growth, can no longer be allowed, since the Nemesis of the industrial era is now striking back at us. This may sound a bit solemn, but that is how I see it.

9.

AB: In many countries, questions related to disarmament and peace are highly controversial. Would you anticipate any difficulties, for example with parents or other members of the community, when introducing peace education in schools? If so, what kind of difficulties? Do you see any way out of such problems?

SK: In my own teaching, i.e. at the university and in adult education, the problem of parents worrying about indoctrination does not exist. My students of peace have chosen the subjects themselves, and they have chosen me to teach them. In the Danish elementary school, however, there are great problems of local school boards prohibiting the subject and parents protesting, but there are also many examples to the

contrary. I am not the right person to answer that question, but Danish school teachers, for example those in "Teachers for Peace", have a lot to say about it. By the way, I would like to take this opportunity to recommend that you get in touch with Knud Gammelgård, lecturer at the Hjørring School of Education. He and his students have prepared some valuable pedagogical material for the school, and they have also started an organization to distribute information in this field ("The Organization for the Distribution of Knowledge about International Development, Peace and Security").

10.

AB: What needs to be done in teacher training in order to prepare future teachers more adequately for the area of "peace education"?

SK: Again, I don't think I am the right person to answer that question, and I would like to refer to people who have daily experience of teacher training. But, among other things, it seems natural that the trainee teachers should orient themselves towards the issues of the psychology of peace (knowledge about prejudice, enemy images, how violence becomes accepted, etc.). After that, the possibilities of taking up the various perspectives of the pedagogy of peace could be explored within each separate subject.

11.

AB: Is there anything else that you would like to add about the school and peace education?

SK: As Johan Galtung has pointed out, the school itself often functions as a system that promotes structural violence (by emphasizing differences). This is a problem that creates difficulties.

AB: Do you see any way for a teacher who is interested in peace to work with and, perhaps, even overcome these difficulties?

SK: I myself do not advocate a "banalization" of structural violence, for example by saying that "minor violence"

in the school yard, mobbing etc., is only a miniature variety of "major violence". The structural violence in society and at school, i.e. the factors that create differences and violence, goes far deeper, and it is nothing that I can give pedagogic directions for off-hand.

On the whole, I think that all teachers who are deeply involved in this area should take care not to use the students' anxiety - exploit it, so to speak. One of the most memorable articles I have read on this subject, was about a conversation on a local train in Copenhagen between two students who had been "forced to participate" in a special week about peace at their school. They were making fun of how, on the teacher's instructions, they had baked "peace cookies" and performed other rituals which seemed rather meaningless or downright comical to them. I think it's very important for us as teachers to be sensitive to when the students experience the subject as something that thrusts itself upon them, as something that is necessary - and to try to do something about it then and there. Then teachers must not only have a repertory of important attitudes and feelings at their disposal, but they must also be well-informed, know something about connections - for example, the surprising similarity between the computer games the boys play at home and the simulators used today in training soldiers how to shoot down real missiles.

On the whole, teachers should not underestimate the possibility that the students may have a fairly good knowledge of this area as well as quite a number of ambivalences about it. Some of the interviews with schoolchildren that I have read indicate that they may be fairly knowledgeable about these matters but that, in order to bear this knowledge, they have built up a considerable number of defense mechanisms. It is no small pedagogical/psychological task to handle this situation - and to avoid leaving the students in the lurch with this "hell" milling about in their sub-

- 90 -

conscious minds. But it's not impossible. In Gandhi's words: "There is no way to peace. Peace is the way!"

NOTES ON THE INTERVIEWEE

Søren Keldorff. Address: Elmelunden 15, DK-9260 Gistrup, Denmark. - Ass. Professor of Psychology at the Department of Social Science, University Center of Aalborg (AUC), Denmark. Member of the Research Group of Psychology for Peace, the AUC Group of Peace and Conflict Research and the Cross-National Image of the Enemy Project. Board member of the Danish Peace Foundation.

Selected publications

Daydreaming - a pathway to positive peace. (Congress paper.) Helsinki: Congress of European Psychologists for Peace, 1986.

Hvorfor krig? Kommentarer till en ny kold krig. /Why war? Comments on a new cold war./ Aalborg, Denmark: Aalborg Universitetsforlag, 1986.

Holdninger til kaprustning og bekymring for atomkrig. /Attitudes to the arms race and worries related to nuclear war./ Gistrup, Denmark: Edupax, 1989.

(Together with J. Pauli Jensen, editors.) Fredsundervisning: Psykologi og pædagogik til fredsarbejdet. /Peace education: The psychology and pedagogics of working for peace./ Copenhagen: Gyldendal, 1984.

Stig Lindholm

1.

AB: As an introduction, could you say a few words about yourself and your interest in the field of "peace education"?

SL: That is a long story, dating back to the mid-60s. I think I started to work with peace research in 1966. At that time I also directed an interdisciplinary series of seminars, a general intellectual playground, with writers, journalists and researchers. In those days there was more money, so you could easily invite guest lecturers. Then, towards the end of the 60s, I gradually started to work with issues concerning the developing countries and, in the early 70s, "development education". As you know, my doctoral dissertation, presented in 1970, dealt with opinions about developing countries. In this period, in 1973 to be more exact, I also made a trip to Latin America connected with "development education". After that, there was a period when I mainly devoted myself for several years to scientific theory and the fragmentation of knowledge.

Then I tried to connect the three main directions of my research - peace, development and the issues of knowledge - and that is when I took up the theme I call "a pedagogy for development and peace".

AB: Have you personally been involved in the issues of peace apart from in your research?

SL: Not very much. I am a member of Researchers against Nuclear Weapons, I go on lecture tours now and then, and I have had an interdisciplinary series of seminars. That is a forum where researchers as well as peace activists can meet.

AB: When you started to do peace research in the 60s, was there a group working with those questions or were you working on your own?

SL: There was a small group of us. In those days there were sixty-point, or third-term, students who could write good, solid papers, and we published some of those. The first one was called "Peace Research from a Psychological Point of View" - it was written by three

students, and it was quite good. We also discussed how the developing countries were treated in teaching materials and similar matters.

AB: Could you say something brief about your work in this field during the last few years?

SL: For one thing, I have had a couple of C1 (third term) students who have interviewed doctors and engineers who are against nuclear weapons. Then Toni Lindfors has compiled a report of a questionnaire sent to school administrators in upper secondary schools all over the country.

I myself have written a report about how 1,000 upper-secondary school students look at peace education (available in Swedish and English), and I have also tried to apply Jungian approaches to peace questions and the influencing of public opinion in a paper about the murder of Olof Palme and the collective subconscious. Now I would like to develop the theoretical perspectives in peace and quiet. The majority of the work on peace and development is being done within the disciplines of sociology, economics and political science. Macro-thinking is predominant. The psychological perspective needs to be developed more. As far as I remember, I have never come across such concepts as "the collective subconscious" in the contexts of peace research and development research. I think that such concepts are needed as a complement to the others, and I would like to devote myself to studying what can be made of them.

2.

AB: What do you think of first when you hear the words "peace education"?

SL: Personally, I think it is important not to confine ourselves to what is conventionally perceived as peace; I would like to include both development and human rights in this context. I believe that human rights are an important area, and I think that when

the perspective of action is considered, it is a very good thing to include it, because this is an area where there are activities that students and teachers can get involved in, for example in Amnesty. I would like to add ecology to peace, development and human rights, but then it turns into such a long title, and you risk having a pedagogy for all that is good, so you have to make a selection. Then I prefer to make ecology part of what I call "development".

As far as "fredsfostran" ("training for peace") is concerned, I have been a bit allergic to that term, and I think that is due to what generation you belong to. In actual fact, it should be a good thing, because as far as I can understand, training has to do with ethics and values. On the one hand, then, I have renounced that term, but on the other hand I have begun to consider whether it might be reintroduced in one way or another. But training sounds so authoritarian. The best thing would be if a new term could be found. If you go outside the school situation, can you talk about the training of your fellow human beings in this area? I am not at all sure about that.

Therefore I am calling my area of interest "a pedagogy for development and peace" for the time being. It corresponds to "development and peace education" in English.

3.

AB: If you think back on your own school days, were there some aspects in your schooling that might be considered an attempt at "peace education"?

SL: No, I don't think so. On the contrary, I was "brought up for war", as Eva Moberg likes to put it. There was a lot about Charles XII and Gustavus II Adolphus. I cannot remember any orientation towards peace. The history instruction we got was pathetic.

4.

AB: Do you believe that schools in your country, as you know them today, contribute to a "peace education"?

SL: I hope so. They might do it to a larger extent. I think this is on its way, and it is clear that the efforts of the National Board of Education and of Bengt Thelin have legitimized it, so that life has become a little easier for the occasional torch bearers who are out there. But I think there is resistance, from colleagues and sometimes also from school administrators and local boards of education, so I think you should be wary of exaggerating about what has been going on up to now. I think many people feel uncertain. The debate in the teachers' publications and in the daily paper Svenska Dagbladet is also likely to have deterred some people who would like to get involved because of its extremely emotional character. But, as someone said: "The school is the largest company in the world - we cannot afford to lose the possibilities it offers."

5.

AB: Do you think it is at all possible for schools to contribute to a "peace education"? If so, what are some of the steps and measures to be taken that you think of first?

SL: It is often said that peace education should not be a separate subject, and I agree. But I think that at the stage where we are just now, we must come up with some so-called publicity stunts, that is we must resort to specific measures that catch people's attention. I think there should be special days that focus on the theme of peace, illustrating it and making it visible. Then I wish that peace and development could be discussed in all the subjects, not least in natural science - I am thinking about chemistry and physics, for example. There are many contexts where that aspect could be brought up, and I suppose the question of how

to bring it up also affects teacher training.

One difficulty that we ran into in teaching about the developing countries was that the teacher should be objective and, at the same time, create a positive attitude towards aid to developing countries and an understanding of the predicament of the poor countries. I suppose you encounter the same problem in working with questions of peace. I think it is important that the person whom the students meet is really committed, and I would like people representing various perspectives to be invited (the national defense, peace movements, Amnesty, the Red Cross, for example), so that committed people representing different positions might be given a chance to have their say.

Then, of course, we are always short of time at school; there are so many things that compete for a place in the curriculum. So what the schools can do, I suppose, is to give the students a stimulating push, and then, hopefully, they will join groups that work with these issues: peace movements, political parties (there are, after all, people who are interested in peace in all the political parties), groups within various professions working for peace, Amnesty, the Red Cross etc. I think the main part of the work has to take place outside school, but the students' interest could be aroused at school so that they got more involved. Since it seems to me that the school curriculum is quite jammed, you cannot expect the schools to take on just any amount of work. What they can do, however, is to provide basic knowledge and create an interest, so that the students go on on their own, outside school.

AB: You mentioned in passing the role of natural sciences at school. Could you enlarge on that a little?

SL: Both physics and chemistry have relevant information about nuclear weapons, for example. Chemistry and biology are important when it comes to CB weapons, which tend to be overlooked, I think. I'm tired of

the constant fixation on nuclear weapons. Of course, they are very important. But I'm afraid that while we are devoting ourselves to nuclear weapons and fighting them with all our might, chemical and biological weapons can be developed in peace and quiet; we also have to take the so-called improvement of conventional weapons into account. I think it is about time we widened our frame of interest a little bit, and physics, chemistry and biology are directly connected with this.

I also think it is very important that the economic consequences of armament should be discussed. I would like Inga Thorsson's reports - asserting, among other things, that civilian production creates more job opportunities than military production - to be taken up, so that this message reaches people somehow.

Naturally social studies and psychology are important subjects in this context. We all know that. But I also find the natural science people and the technologists important, and there you have the professional groups again. Therefore I think that Engineers against Nuclear Weapons is an interesting and important group. You can invite them to talk about the technical aspects. Then you have Physicians against Nuclear Weapons, which is a group with a great impact. Doctors are seen and heard a lot in the mass media, but maybe we should pay more attention to the engineers and use them more. They are a group we do not think about very often in this context.

6.

AB: What would be some of the possible differences in peace education approaches among younger and older students in schools?

SL: I have never done any research about younger students, so I am only an amateur as far as they are concerned. But of course you have to adapt yourself to the various levels.

AB: Does the questionnaire material you have been working with only apply to upper secondary school?

SL: Yes, it was aimed at school administrators in the upper secondary school, and there was also a questionnaire for 1,000 students, all of them in upper secondary school. That is all we have.

AB: Are there any results that you think are worth mentioning?

SL: There is a distinct difference between boys and girls. Girls care more, they seem to be more involved. This can also be observed among adults. As you know, we have a seminar. When we have invited someone who is not very famous, some 80-90 % of those who attend are women. If a well-known speaker has been invited, 60 % are women. Obviously women are more involved in the subject as such. By the way, this is a strong trend which can be observed in many studies carried out in different countries. That was the most palpable thing in the pattern of results. - When it comes to the course programmes in upper secondary school, the results were more vague and difficult to interpret, since different schools were involved.

7.

AB: If you were an upper-secondary school teacher in a subject with which you are particularly familiar, how would you like to make the students more conscious of and more prepared for problems of peace, within that subject?

SL: That would be in psychology, then. In that case, I would take up psychological aspects of various kinds. Among other things, I would discuss how we react when we confront danger and how we tend to repress and deny things. I would take up one of my favourite themes: the inner oppressor, who tells us that since we cannot do anything, we don't have any responsibility. I would say that your first step in working for peace is to throw him or her out, whatever sex this inner oppressor of yours may be. In addition to the factors that operate on the individual level, I would also point to

the collective, unconscious processes and the cultural factors, I think. Now I am assuming that I teach at upper secondary school.

8.

AB: In international debates, the terms "disarmament education" and "peace education" have been used, in addition to some other related terms ("global education", "education for international understanding" etc.). Do you have any comments and preferences as to this terminology?

SL: As I mentioned earlier, I do not like to use the Swedish term "fredsfostran". I think there are too many of us who associate "fostran" (training or "upbringing") with authoritarianism. In adult education, for example, it feels a bit presumptuous to "bring up" your fellow human beings. Consequently I call it a "pedagogy for development and peace", but that may be perceived as a research area. If we say "peace education, development education and education about human rights", it sounds clumsy. But if we say "fredsundervisning" ("peace instruction" or "peace education"), some people may only think about fighting against nuclear weapons and armament. It is too narrow a peace concept. That is why I want to include "development".

AB: You don't feel that the term "undervisning" itself refers to too narrow a concept?

SL: I am uncertain about that. To some people, "undervisning" may only represent facts and cognitive matters. Personally, I have a lot of faith in the importance of the example. Teachers convey facts, but they are also, for better or for worse, examples of how you behave in life. This is an important element of being a teacher, whether you are a professor or an upper-secondary or elementary-school teacher. I'm not sure whether it's part of the concept of "undervisning". There was a period, maybe in the 50s, 60s and 70s, when it was not "with-it" for adults to set a good example. It was not

quite accepted, and, understandably, there was opposition to authoritarian child-rearing in those days. But I think we are shutting our eyes to reality if we don't perceive that we do indeed set an example.

AB: How do you look at the English terms that were mentioned earlier: "disarmament education", "global education", "education for international understanding"?

SL: When I hear "disarmament education", I think about UNESCO; they are the ones who have used that term a lot, I think. But as a matter of fact, I find it too narrow. It may have been politically motivated to use it in some contexts, but it's much too narrow. "Global education", on the other hand, tends to become vague and fuzzy - it doesn't appeal to me very much. I find "education for international understanding" a better term, but that, too, is a bit vague. I myself would insist on propounding the term "development and peace education" in order to emphasize that we go outside the narrow concept of "peace", but without widening the field into "education for all good things". Admittedly, it's a bit difficult to translate "development education". I don't think we have quite succeeded in doing that. When I speak about it as a research area, I call it a "pedagogy for development and peace". As a teaching assignment, I might call it "teaching the issues of peace and development", but I haven't really thought this through yet. I think the most important thing is that the word "development" should be included, and then you will have to discuss what it should contain. In that way, you emphasize that it's not only a matter of disarmament education.

AB: What do you personally think of first when you speak about development in this context?

SL: Then I think about the development in the rich and the poor countries, as well as the relationship between them. I also find it important to link development with peace, because that is how you can introduce the concepts of "security" and "vulnerability". I think it's important

to see to it that there are possibilities for action whenever you teach about peace and development. Furthermore, it's essential to try to dissolve this unfortunate dichotomy: either you are a pacifist, and then you are against any kind of military defense, or you are a militarist, and then you want the defense that we already have, only more of it.

This attitude, which I think is shared by many people, is untenable. We must have a discussion about an alternative security policy. I myself am not a pacifist - I think it would be unfortunate if we started to disarm unilaterally, because that would worry one of the blocs; but I'm not at all sure that we have the best type of security system. We must link our security thinking to our development and consider the risks of concentrating on enormous large-scale production. I think we have only got one yeast factory, and there aren't many shoe factories left. Our computer systems and nuclear power plants are vulnerable. In many ways, we live in an extremely vulnerable society. However, security also involves seeing to it that we are less vulnerable: how is the production of essential goods organized? It needs to be decentralized, to put it simply.

I hope the debate about alternative security and what security means will become more sophisticated in the next ten years. Then, military defense will be one part of our security policy, but the domestic organization of our production and administration is also an important part, and the current situation is frightening. You only have to think about the power outage on 27 December a couple of years ago to realize how easily we are neutralized. And imagine a terrorist at a nuclear power plant - it isn't easy to negotiate there. I think a discussion of those questions of vulnerability would get many more people involved than those who are prepared to call themselves peace activists today. I would like these things to be included in peace education.

9.

AB: In many countries, questions related to disarmament and peace are highly controversial. Would you anticipate any difficulties, for example with parents or other members of the community, when introducing peace education in schools? If so, what kind of difficulties? Do you see any way out of such problems?

SL: Since I have only taught at university level, this has to be secondhand information. But I gather from the debate in the teachers' publications and some of the daily papers that there are people who believe that peace education aims at making the children into pacifists. First of all, that's not at all what it tries to do, and secondly, I think the role of school as an influencing factor in this area is grossly exaggerated, considering how much education for war our entire culture contains. But I think that you have to expect criticism and listen to it and take a stand on it. It may occasionally be justified. But I think that what I have seen of the debate has been very much exaggerated. There is so much education for war in our culture, for example in the mass media and on video, that a certain amount of counterbalance is needed. I believe you must look at the entire scope of programming available, as they often say at the Broadcasting Committee.

AB: One of the opinions that have been propounded in the debate is - to express it a bit clumsily - that you shouldn't frighten young children. Do you have any comment on that?

SL: It goes without saying that I don't think so either. I may occasionally have met the attitude among teachers that "now we must talk about how terrible nuclear weapons are". Of course, you shouldn't conceal reality, but I don't think that is a very good starting-point. I have always been negative to scaremongering; I was against it in connection with the problems of the developing countries as well. I didn't like it very much when a lot of pictures of starving children were

shown, because I think that is a bad way of increasing people's interest in the developing countries. Similarly, I believe scaremongering is a bad way of increasing people's interest in peace issues, since there is a risk of causing paralysis and there is already so much in the mass media that tends to paralyze people. I think that people in general realize fairly well that a nuclear war would be hell, quite literally. You don't have to put the stress too much on mega-death. I think the most important thing is to visualize hope.

As you know, there are examples in history of people succeeding in turning a development they found negative around. In our countries, the labor movement is a good example. In 1909, after the general strike had failed, sensible people said that "this is nothing for workers to get involved in". But those who believed in "the impossible" made it possible. The women's movement and the co-operative movement have also made such achievements. There are, in fact, many types of popular movements that have succeeded, and the best example in our time may be the Action Group against a Swedish Nuclear Bomb. Those people who pondered Swedish nuclear weapons weren't extreme militarists. If I'm correctly informed by the press, Erlander, for example, was one of them. But it was women, both "leftists" and others, who opposed it. Then, assisted by the peace movement, they mobilized opinion and gradually won support in the Swedish Parliament. That is a fine and comforting example of resistance being rewarded.

The risk of too much negative propaganda - and the mass media are so full of catastrophes - is that it contributes to making people passive and defeatist. Consequently I don't think too much time should be spent in peace education on describing how miserable things are. Young people know that, and so do adults.

10.

AB: What needs to be done in teacher training in order to prepare future teachers more adequately for the area of "peace education"?

SL: I feel like an amateur in this area, since I have only been involved in continuing education concerning the developing countries. What I would like to bring up for discussion in teacher training and in the continuing education of teachers is their role as models and examples, to make an issue of it and discuss how it is experienced by teachers themselves. I think it's important for teachers to be visible, but that's something that may come into conflict with the demand for objectivity. I think it's essential that teachers have the right to clarify where they stand. It would be confusing if they had to feign some kind of total neutrality. You shouldn't underestimate young people's ability to draw their own conclusions and take a stance. In my opinion, they follow neither their teachers nor their parents in a slavish way.

As for the questions concerning the developing countries, we thought it was very important to explore contexts and structures. Pictures of starving children and other things that aroused compassion were often used, and then we pointed out that you must also try to understand how things are connected. The same thing goes for the questions of peace. Among other things, I wish that, at least in teacher training, the different types of explanations within peace research were brought up. If I remember correctly, Håkan Wiberg has done so. You should obtain a certain overview of the various theories that exist, so that you get the intellectual tools and can complement the emotional with an intellectual analysis.

11.

AB: Is there anything else that you would like to add about the school and peace education?

SL: I usually emphasize two things: first, you should counteract hopelessness - visualize hope; second, you should see to it that there are possibilities to act. And I don't think you should be too fastidious at the

beginning. You shouldn't believe that your first act will lead to total disarmament. The important thing is to do something, so that you get outside all this reading and writing. I think that can be done to a fairly large extent outside the school. That's why I claim that contacts with various groups are important: peace movements, political parties, Amnesty, Africa groups, etc. In order to counteract hopelessness it is important to get something started and, at the same time, to realize that you need the support of others, that you are not particularly neurotic if you think this is a tough job to get into. In his book "Everybody was talking about peace", Richter pointed out the importance of support groups. There's no reason to be ashamed of needing those.

NOTES ON THE INTERVIEWEE

Stig Lindholm is a psychologist and Associate Professor of Educational Psychology at the University of Stockholm (Department of Education, S-106 91 Stockholm, Sweden) and is Head of Research at the Nordic Center for Community Work, University of Örebro. He also leads the Institute for Educational Development - a private think tank - in Stockholm and Copenhagen.

Selected publications

The image of the developing countries: An inquiry into Swedish public opinion. Stockholm: Almqvist & Wiksell, 1971.

Vetenskap, verklighet och paradigm. /Science, reality, and paradigms./ Stockholm: Almqvist & Wiksell, 1980.

Kunskap - från fragment till helhetssyn. /Knowledge - from fragments to holistic views./ Stockholm: Liber, 1985.

A thousand students on war, peace and peace education. Paper written for the Eleventh General Conference of The International Peace Research Association, University of Sussex, England, 1986. (Mimeo, Department of Education, University of Stockholm.)

1.

AB: As an introduction, could you say a few words about yourself and your interest in the field of "peace education"?

VM: I am a researcher, working in the field of comparative education, and one of the aspects of comparative education, as I see it, is peace education. I have been interested in the problem for more than 20 years. I have been teaching in elementary and secondary schools and have been involved in activities related to international education. In my school, we organized an international club, a club for international friendship, and the activities of the class were very wide and the students were very interested in this. Even now that these students are grown-up people, they still remember these old activities. So that was how I got started.

AB: I know that you are involved now in a project related to Eva Nordland's work. Could you say a few words about that?

VM: Our project was started in February 1988, and the idea was to make a research study - independent and parallel research - on the theme of responsibility, care and other aspects of peace education. Later on, environmental education was also included.

Perhaps you have read the book "Breakthrough". We would like to do something similar. We hope to bring together ideas from American, Soviet and Norwegian people, illustrating approaches to such things as human rights, ecological education, social responsibility, cooperative education and how to work with these themes at different levels of the school. There will be a collection of papers as a result of our cooperative work.

2.

AB: What do you think of first when you hear the words "peace education"?

VM: Earlier we didn't use the term "peace education", but we talked about "international education", and although the meaning is different, it is related in some respects. Later on we began to use the expression "peace education". Thinking about the essence of the activity, I got accustomed to that many, many years ago when I started my work at school. Later on we had to coordinate the ideas of international education we had at our school with some of the ideas that were not present in our work in international education, but which are now seen as part of peace education.

AB: Is the term "peace education" or the translation of it used in your country widely?

VM: Yes, it is. We are developing a theoretical base for peace education.

3.

AB: If you think back on your own school days, were there some aspects in your schooling that might be considered an attempt at "peace education"?

VM: It was long ago. I finished schooling the year the Second World War ended. So, of course, at that time peace education wasn't used, I'm afraid. We needed peace, but we were surrounded by war. So that was a special time.

4.

AB: Do you believe that schools in your country, as you know them today, contribute to a "peace education"?

VM: I do, at least in some ways. Some of them may be contributing in a more active way, while others are not so very active. In every school we have those clubs for international friendship. They may not always be so active, but they exist anyhow. We also have a lesson of peace on the very first day of every school year. That often means that the children are preparing for the

lesson, and they are trying to say what they have done during the previous year for peace. It may be done in different ways - it depends upon the school.

AB: How long has that lesson of peace existed in your country?

VM: For about six years.

AB: And these initial peace lessons are carried out all over the country?

VM: Yes.

5.

AB: Do you think it is at all possible for schools to contribute to a "peace education"? If so, what are some of the steps and measures to be taken that you think of first?

VM: Yes, I think it is possible. But, of course, I think that there are a lot of things that can be done to help the teachers and the students to make it more effective. Sometimes it is a little bit formalized. It is not always very penetrating. As far as our schools are concerned, we have usually oriented this work towards the world outside our country. But I think that peace education should also deal with our internal problems and with peace in our homes. So we have to reorient this kind of education a little bit. To my mind we should also develop such things as teaching the teachers how to teach the students to overcome stereotypes and to develop their critical thinking and such skills as care, responsibility, conflict resolution and others that are necessary for a broad education for peace.

6.

AB: What would be some of the possible differences in peace education approaches among younger and older students in schools?

VM: The students are very different in the first and second grades and the upper high school. The younger pupils are simply not able to understand parts of the relevant

content. Not only the content but also the methods should be adapted to the capability of their age level.

One aspect of peace education that should be developed early is the multi-cultural approach. Most of our communities are multi-national communities. First of all the children have to know about their own traditions. They have to know about their own peculiarities. And then they have to know that there are other people living next to them who are similar to them in many respects, but who have their own traditions and peculiarities. This could be dealt with in the kindergarten and in the elementary school, maybe using songs and dolls in different costumes as the starting-point for a discussion.

7.

AB: If you were an upper-secondary school teacher in a subject with which you are particularly familiar, how would you like to make the students more conscious of and more prepared for problems of peace, within that subject?

VM: I have been a teacher of English. Using a lot of texts and additional materials, I have to show our students how English people live and how American people live. I try to show that they are different from us in some respects, but at the same time they have the same needs. While preparing myself, I try to find the kind of material that can make my students understand these things and develop their attitudes towards foreign people. Sometimes we still have stereotypes that have to be analyzed for the sake of overcoming them.

8.

AB: In international debates, the terms "disarmament education" and "peace education" have been used, in addition to some other related terms ("global education", "education for international understanding" etc.). Do you have any comments and preferences as to this terminology?

VM: To my mind "disarmament education" is a part of peace education or global education - one of the important

parts. "Education for international understanding" is also a part of peace education or global education. First I preferred the term "international education", but now I think that "global education" is better. Many of the problems that we have are really global.

9.

AB: In many countries, questions related to disarmament and peace are highly controversial. Would you anticipate any difficulties, for example with parents or other members of the community, when introducing peace education in schools? If so, what kind of difficulties? Do you see any way out of such problems?

VM: About three years ago, we had some difficulties especially in disarmament education. But with the new changes in our society - for example, we are cutting down the military budget - it is becoming easier. Using the term "international education" has not been difficult in our country, but when we try to make comparative research and speak about the same things with people outside our country, it has sometimes been difficult.

If we meet difficulties with parents, we have to discuss with them, showing them that we really need disarmament education because of the changes in society. Of course, there are still parents or students who have other opinions, and we should be prepared for pluralistic views.

10.

AB: What needs to be done in teacher training in order to prepare future teachers more adequately for the area of "peace education"?

VM: I think we have some problems in preparing new teachers at the teacher-training institutes. While they are taught about the subjects they are going to teach - let's say physics, chemistry etc. - they have special parts of the courses that deal with disarmament and peace education, but this instruction is comparatively short. We need to extend it, perhaps even have a special

course on peace education or global education, which they have in some institutes.

About a year and a half ago we started the Soviet movement "Educators for Peace and Mutual Understanding" (see Appendix). I am on the board of that, my responsibility being international cooperation among teachers. Through this organization, we are now trying to prepare special courses for teacher training.

AB: Is this a large group of teachers?

VM: It's a movement, it's not a group. In every region of the Soviet Union, we have people who accept our goals and means, and so they are becoming more active in this. Some of them were active earlier, but simply were not enough informed, well-oriented or cooperative. Now we try to find the most urgent problems that we have to solve together. One of these problems is how to help teacher-training institutes with peace education.

11.

AB: In many schools, the students represent a variety of nationalities and cultural backgrounds. To what extent would it be possible to use this fact as an aid in education for peace? Would you expect some difficulties in doing so?

VM: In our country we have about 150 nationalities and ethnic groups, and in many communities you find three or four, or even ten or eleven, representatives of different nationalities. For many years we thought that this was really a good thing for international education, because our students would have different groups, not far away but close to them, and this fact was used for the sake of international education. But then we found out that not everything was working well. Why? One of the reasons was that we have a centralized system of education where the teachers had the same goals and the same methods, and they did not take the peculiarities of the different areas into

consideration. We have problems with our national subgroups, problems of a psychological, economic and social character. As educators we still have not done what we can to help resolve these problems.

12.

AB: Sometimes the term "global survival" is used to refer to an area dealing both with the risks of nuclear war and with the risks of far-reaching environmental damage through pollution and the overuse of resources. How do you look upon dealing with these two categories of risks together in school? Do you have any suggestions as to how the teacher could approach the problem area of environmental damage?

VM: It is a very complicated problem - we often speak about threats to the environment. I think the first thing to do is to raise the general cultural level, because they may know the risks of this or that, but they are not culturally prepared for it, so it becomes just superficial knowledge, but no clear attitude.

We are speaking about the risks of nuclear war and all the damages related to it, but at the same time we have the trouble of Chernobyl. This is also a kind of war - a war against our neglect and irresponsibility. It was also like a small war for our country, because in practice we lost a territory and had severe damage to the people. So I think these things have to be included in our education. We need to fight our irresponsibility, for example, in the nuclear field.

13.

AB: Is there anything else that you would like to add about the school and peace education?

VM: The increasing cooperation among educators from different countries at international levels is important. I think that it is a good thing that we are working together, that we will see that we have problems in common and discuss how to overcome them.

Many of our problems are now global, and exchange programs between schools help us to understand these problems and make us better prepared to work with them.

NOTES ON THE INTERVIEWEE

Valentina Mitina. Address: Research Institute of General Pedagogy, Pavla Korchagina Street, House N7, 1292, Moscow, USSR.

After graduation from the Pedagogical Institute Dr. Mitina has been teaching English for 20 years (all levels of education). Since 1971 she has been a senior researcher, specializing in comparative education. Now she is working at the Research Institute of General Pedagogy, USSR Academy of Pedagogical Sciences. She is the author of more than 50 works on comparative education, peace education etc. Dr. Mitina is an activist in some non-government organizations. She is on the board of the Soviet movement "Educators for Peace and Mutual Understanding".

SOVIET COMMITTEE OF THE MOVEMENT "EDUCATORS FOR PEACE
AND MUTUAL UNDERSTANDING"

Secretariat:
42, Lenin Ave., Gate I, Room 1255a
Moscow, USSR
Tel: 930-84-86

I. GOALS OF THE MOVEMENT:

- a. To shape new political thinking;
- b. To promote social and political activity of the teaching community for the good of peace and mutual understanding;
- c. To improve the education of the rising generation for peace and international cooperation.

II. THE TASKS OF THE MOVEMENT:

- a. To intensify a scientific interpretation by the teaching community of the challenges facing the present-day world, of the new philosophy of international relations, and of the comprehensive system of international security;
- b. To promote the pooling and coordination of the efforts by Soviet mass organizations in the education of children and young people for peace;
- c. To encourage the summing up and spreading of advanced experience, new ideas and initiatives in education for peace;
- d. To promote the specialized training of educators of all forms, types, and levels of education for educational work in this direction;
- e. To encourage the many-sided activity of all types of educational establishments for bringing up the pupils and students in the spirit of peace, internationalism, and patriotism;
- f. To promote scientific research, elaboration of methods and method manuals for those practically involved in education for peace process;

- g. To arrange actions by the teaching community for peace, international security and disarmament, and provide all-round support to the peace-oriented activity of Soviet public organizations at national and international levels;
- h. To participate in the international activity of the teaching community with an eye to strengthening international understanding and peace and education for peace;
- i. To establish and promote ties with international organizations, scientific institutions, and specialists from different countries with a view to elaborating the theory and practice of education for peace, preparing appropriate publications, teaching aids and material, and disseminating this material;
- j. To invigorate bilateral and multilateral ties with national teachers' movements for peace, in particular with the aim of founding an international movement of teachers for peace;
- k. The movements' objective is also to spread the ideas and promote the implementation of the Recommendations concerning education for international understanding, cooperation and peace, and education relating to human rights and fundamental freedoms adopted by the UNESCO General Conference at its 18th Session in 1974, as well as the Recommendations of the Intergovernmental Conference on education for international understanding, cooperation and peace, and education relating to human rights and fundamental freedoms for the purpose of moulding public opinion to promote security and disarmament, held in Paris in 1983.

III. PROGRAMS OF ACTIVITY:

- 1. Selection, preparation, publicizing and dissemination of material on the new political thinking, general security, education for peace for subsequent independent work, and for the teacher-

training and retraining systems. Organization of the elaboration of curricula and method manuals for these systems.

2. Involvement of the teaching community in vigorous activity for peace.
3. Planning and elaboration of joint actions for peace and peace education together with other public forces and movements, in particular, with the mass media.
4. Working out new forms and methods of education for peace and supporting such tested ones as Peace Lessons, Peace Museums, and the "Children Build Peace Together" movement, among others.
5. Elaboration of proposals for the improvement of education for peace and international understanding at educational and extracurricular institutions of all types, and proposals relating to a revision of textbooks and teaching aids for the same purposes.
6. Establishment of close ties with UNESCO, UNICEF, and other governmental and non-governmental international organizations with a view to fostering education for peace, drafting bulletins, proposals, recommendations, documents for international meetings of specialists, congresses and conferences, and participation in such events.
7. Support for the international movement of teachers for peace, and assistance in the founding of an international organization, Teachers for Peace.

The basis of the movement is formed by voluntary public groups which are established at educational and extracurricular institutions of all types and levels; at the request of members of these groups they can be established at a definite educational institution of a township, city, or administrative district regardless of the departmental subordination of the educators affiliated to the group.

The groups establish ties between themselves and also with the Soviet committee of the movement for the purpose of information and coordination of their

- 119 -

activities (any accountability is ruled out). In the event of a considerable growth of the number of groups and participants in the movement, city and regional public committees of the movement could be set up.

1.

AB: As an introduction, could you say a few words about yourself and your interest in the field of "peace education"?

HR: I am a member of the Department of Education at the Technical University of Berlin, working in the field of methodology of social studies. My interest in peace education may be traced back to the philosophical, ethical and religious background of my Protestant upbringing. I also want to mention my experiences as a student at a College of Higher Education (Pädagogische Hochschule), a college devoted to teacher training. Here I learnt the methods as well as the philosophical, sociological and psychological backgrounds of the so-called German "Reformpädagogik" (the "New Education" of England, the "Progressive Education" of the United States), an educational reform movement from the beginning of the century, and even earlier. Within this area of education you will find several approaches similar to those we are now discussing under the term Peace Education. This tree of education is reproducing itself because education for peace and international understanding did belong to some of the works of educationalists in this period.

My own work in peace education, however, began about seven to eight years ago when the deployment of cruise missiles in Germany became a public issue. A friend of mine, a colleague at the Technical University and I organized a lecture series (Ringvorlesung) in the winter term 1979/80 on peace education within subject teaching. We asked several colleagues from the Free University of Berlin and the Academy of Arts and Music in Berlin (Hochschule der Künste) to contribute to the lecture series from their point of view, from their subjects. This was the starting point for dealing with peace education in teacher training

for me and my institute, too, which gave me a lot of personal and financial support. In 1983, I was a visiting professor to the Richardson Institute for Conflict and Peace Research at the University of Lancaster (UK). Together with Paul Smoker, the Director of the Institute, I conducted a survey on the British Local Education Authorities Policy on Peace Education published as "Peace Education in Great Britain". At present I am going to prepare a comparative study on peace education in Germany and Great Britain as well as our taking part in the "3rd International Workshop on Peace Education" to be held in Ameland (NL) which is an event particularly devoted to trainee teachers.

2.

AB: What do you think of first when you hear the words "peace education"?

HR: Peace education is, in my opinion, not only a theory but also a special approach to help pupils and students understand their society and its development and to live and act politically, to act locally and later globally in such a way as to help to overcome conflicts at all levels - at the interpersonal level, the community level, the national level, and the international level. I share with several definitions on peace education a concern also for what Galtung termed structural violence in addition to physical violence. The economical relations between the industrialized and the so-called underdeveloped countries are a good example of structural violence in my view. For example, look at the relationship between a hamburger and the tropical rain forest in South America. Rain forests were being destroyed so cattle could be put out to pasture, before becoming beef for an American hamburger chain of stores. Only after non-violent protests from ecological activists, which damaged hamburger sales, were the rain forests no longer in such great danger

from the cattle industry.

Peace education is also concerned with the issue of prejudices and enemy images and with the issue of human rights. It has to do with appreciation of other peoples' values related to one's own perceiving the world. It has to do with empathy: to learn how to look at other cultures from one's own perspective and to look at one's own values from the perspective of others. It also has to do with the preservation of the cultural heritage of mankind as well as the conservation of natural resources.

3.

AB: If you think back on your own school days, were there some aspects in your schooling that might be considered attempts at "peace education"?

HR: I went to school from 1949 to 1962 and first attended a school in the GDR, the German Democratic Republic, for four years. Later on I moved to West-Berlin and attended schools there, and I really cannot see any educational efforts which could have contributed to peace education with one exception. I still remember strong efforts of my primary school teacher in East Germany, in the German Democratic Republic of putting strong emphasis on solidarity with the oppressed, in helping those at the bottom, in achieving equality for all human beings. The tragedy of children's labour in 19th century Britain belonged to the curriculum - and I think it still belongs - of GDR's primary schools in those days.

Moreover, there is the time I spent outside school in the youth work of the Protestant church in West-Berlin. Looking back at that time, I would be able to find some aspects of education for peace. Influenced by Protestant values this time formed my political socialisation, finding responsibilities, duties and real-life challenges. In everyday school life, on the other hand, I did not learn to be responsible for

anything. This is what I consider to be a big problem at the moment: pupils and students are not given the opportunity to identify with and to be responsible for their school.

4.

AB: Do you believe that schools in your country, as you know them today, contribute to a "peace education"?

HR: Taking peace education as I have just defined it - leading pupils and students to a readiness to solve conflicts and problems in a peaceful way - I only know very few schools in Germany which are promoting these aims. Some aspects of peace education are dealt with by a limited number of teachers. Generally speaking, curricula on peace education in social studies do exist in Germany, but they are formal curricula, and what is really going on within the schools normally is not devoted to peace education in a limited meaning. But look at other examples which I would call education for peace: Fifth form students deal with Nelly Sachs' mystery play "Eli" and prepare a theatre performance which is in fact an attempt to understand Israel's martyrdom in history as well as the Jewish martyrdom under the Nazi terror. Or another example: When students in the age of sixteen or seventeen are working for one week in the archives or on the grounds of the former concentration camp Majdanek, in Poland, and recovering traces of victims, then they meet the challenge which our President has expressed in a well known speech commemorating the end of World War II: "The youth is not responsible for what has happened but they are responsible for what will happen to it in further history."

AB: You have been comparing Germany to Great Britain. Do you see any differences in this respect?

HR: This is a complex question. You can't simply compare a very complex situation, so let's find some aspects that can be compared. The practice of peace education

in Germany is influenced, as far as I have experienced the situation, by a strong bureaucracy, by decrees or orders given by the minister of education or the Local Education Authority (Schulaufsicht). In Britain the individual schools are more independent in deciding their curriculum fitting the special needs of their students, their catchment area. Curricula in Germany do have the character of prescription because they are given out by the minister of education in the particular county (Bundesland). Curriculum decisions in British schools are very often up to the headmaster or the staff of a school. So it is easier to introduce formal aspects of peace education in the timetable of a British school than in a German school. On the other hand political and cultural values in Britain are often counterproductive in a certain way. There are strong military traditions in Britain based on several victories in British history. Look also at corporal punishment in schools. And as far as invasions are concerned there was only one in 1066. This history of military power is still influencing public awareness on peaceful and non-violent solutions of conflicts.

In Germany, however, a majority of the younger generation hopefully are not very much fascinated by militaristic behaviour. Young people, very often students, joined in the actions of the peace movement particularly at the beginning of the eighties. This had a strong impact on the peace education movement in Germany and - unimaginable for the British peace education movement - hundreds of German teachers regularly met at national teachers for peace conferences.

5.

AB: Do you think it is at all possible for schools to contribute to a "peace education"? If so, what are some of the steps and measures to be taken that you think of first?

HR: I would like to change your question somewhat. I would say: Could normal schools contribute to education for a peaceful life, to a peaceful society, to peace in relationships? This is a broad concept of peace education - it is not primarily concerned with or related to disarmament education, to problems of the arms race and so on, which is the normal meaning of peace education as thought about by most politicians, for example. So, if I use this broad concept of peace education, I would say: this has to be the basic concept of every school; every school should try to create a climate which is devoted to the definition which I have just given. Secondly a climate in which every pupil or student can say: this is a place which I love, where I like to be, even in my leisure time. We had such experiences before 1933 in some of the "Reformpädagogik"-schools and we know of such experiences even in the post second war area in Germany in small schools, for instance, in schools with only one classroom, the so-called Landschulen. Such schools were not only instruments for society to teach pupils how to behave or what to learn, they were also places of interest, places of leisure, even places of social life for the whole community. This characteristic of being attractive is a very important criterion, and when schools are attractive to pupils, they are also peaceful, as far as I understand this term. Schools should be open, should be places of interest and could be centres of community social life.

AB: You see these as important conditions, but are they sufficient? Are there other things that you would like to add to that or do you feel that you have created an education for peace given these conditions?

HR: Schools should be a centre for the life of young people. If this condition is achieved, peace education could work in a more political way as well. Schools could be centres of political actions in a small scale in a way pupils and students have understood

political life. Then schools could influence the community. It is a process of giving and taking - from the community to the school, from the school to the community. For me this would be an ideal way of practicing peace education. In big schools, this is impossible or incredible. They are like a waiting hall at a railway station. Given certain conditions as to be found in community education centres, e.g. face to face communication, chances for identification, you'll find children changing their attitudes towards their fellow students, towards staff and towards the building, furniture etc.

AB: We know that is very difficult to get these ideal conditions having many big schools. Is there something that you could do in such cases, nevertheless?

HR: O.K., we cannot start with the ideal and optimistic conditions, we have to start with the conditions as they are. What every teacher, every head can do, without changing conditions, is to give children the feeling that they are valuable, that their opinions do matter and that people will listen to them and do take them into account. Confidence building between teacher and student, cooperation and care are as important as smaller learning groups on a formal level. This is what every education authority or any ministry of education should consider as the part of the individual teacher or the staff of the school, whereas the other part has to put more emphasis on smaller learning groups, on reducing the pupils per teacher ratio. Then some of the problems which we have got in greater communities wouldn't arise. The "normal" big system is not favourable for creating peaceful conditions. To some extent this is a question of money, but it is also a question of political priority. To spend a lot of money for the arms race, for example, is a political decision.

6.

AB: What would be some of the possible differences in peace education approaches among younger and older students in schools?

HR: Peace education is a long-term process of changing values. Pupils and students learn our values in everyday family life, in peer-groups, and at school. As teachers we have the task to equate the content of peace education with our teaching attitudes, the teaching behaviour, to equate the manner and the matter of what we are teaching. So "practice what you preach" should be the overall aim for everybody concerned with peace education. As to different levels of education it is clear that developing confidence and care, responsibility and cooperation should be the basis in the primary school - as part of every good education. Informal education could be even more important at this stage than in further ages - the solution of a bully in the classroom, for example, could help to reinforce overall aims of peace education. To reduce stereotypes, prejudices and enemy images in a multicultural society should already begin at this level. At advanced levels of education we'll find subject-oriented approaches more suitable. Look at sciences. Developing social responsibility in using technological advances should belong to the standards of every Maths and Physics teaching. So there is no need to create special curricula on peace education. The only necessity is that teachers bear in mind the objectives of peace education. Nevertheless, I think that this has to be thought through carefully. Think about physical education, for instance. If I make competition the most important thing in physical training, then this could be counter-productive to peace education. In this case peace education is a cross-curricular approach permeating every subject and every hour in the school's timetable.

7.

AB: If you were an upper-secondary school teacher in a subject with which you are particularly familiar, how would you like to make the students more conscious of and more prepared for problems of peace, within that subject?

HR: As mentioned earlier, peace education should be a principle of learning as well as a principle of teaching. In the field of social studies, for instance, we have found project work very successful. School subjects including social studies are reflecting the traditional understanding of sciences as to consider science and teaching isolated from the social-political context. This is reflected in the methodological structure of the lecture as the traditional method to be found in almost every subject in upper secondary schools. Lectures are characterised by instruction based on the structure of university disciplines. And we know that courses of instruction very often isolate facts from their political, economical, and social context. They mainly rely on the subject competence of the instructor, of the teacher and tend to avoid the competence of the students. Following the "practice-what-you-preach" principle peace education issues in schools should refer to co-operative planning. What does this mean?

Every teacher has to be aware of the fact that learning processes have to do with practice in decision sharing. Thus an essential requirement for all projects is the development, realisation and control of the planning by both students and teachers involved. Social reference and practical implications, such as "teach-ins", are the second requirement for project work in the field of peace education at the upper secondary level. It should be important to motivate students to be interested in the subject not only as relevant to their examinations, but also to develop and support the student's motivation and

commitment to transfer the theoretical knowledge into socially effective practice.

The orientation on results is the third requirement. Results of the students' project do not end with an academic report but furthermore influence the social and political environment such as school and public. Here the students find their field for activities and opportunities for experiences. Thus project work is in fact a chance for the students to encourage their political activities. The identification of the students with their studies does definitely grow - there is no doubt - if they are satisfied with the results of their work, which is a real product. Interdisciplinarity and collective realisation last but not least should be part of every project work. Team-teaching should be mentioned in this case. Finally students and teachers should discuss their cooperative work, how they dealt with present difficulties, which problems were involved in their interaction, how conflicts arose among members of the group and how they were solved. In this context authenticity of the teachers seems to be one of the main requirements for being part of the group process.

AB: Could you give an example of this kind of project work?

HR: I mentioned earlier the exploitation of the Third World as to the tropical rain forests in Brasil. We know that the ecological system of the tropical rain forest in this part of the world is threatened by producing crops for animal production in Europe and North-America or erasing the forests by burning and using the land for cattle. These cattle stocks are often belonging to fast-food chains in Northern America or Europe. Hamburgers at the end of this chain therefore are destroying natural resources in this part of the world. I know of projects which had a considerable impact in the public opinion carried out by upper secondary students which sharpened the awareness for this fact. This project included subject

oriented competence as well as skills for political action as part of an effective school work. Peace education permeated in this case geography, biology and social studies lessons.

I think that knowledge must be linked with political actions at a level which is adapted to secondary school students. All processes and all actions must arise, however, from the students. As a teacher I must not press - this would be contrary to peace education - pupils and students in the direction of my opinion or my political standpoint. So the decisions and plans of the classroom group are an essential basis of project work.

8.

AB: In international debates, the terms "disarmament education" and "peace education" have been used, in addition to some other related terms ("global education", "education for international understanding" etc.). Do you have any comments and preferences as to this terminology?

HR: Traditionally our education system is almost past- and present-oriented although it pretends to educate students for their future life. Contrary to that, global education as developed at the York Centre for Global Education by Selby and Pike could be the broadest term for all kinds of positive education. Global education has five goals; they are systems consciousness; perspective consciousness; health of planet awareness; involvement consciousness and preparedness and process mindedness. Systems consciousness means the ability to think in a systems mode avoiding dualities like cause and effect, observer and observed, local and global and consider phenomena in interactive relations. The spider's web could be the image for this mode of thinking. Peace education obviously - as defined before - should use these goals and consider them as its basis. You mentioned

disarmament education. I would consider it as part of education for peace, with a strong impetus on units concerned with the arms race, the nuclear threat etc. The expression international understanding has been used extensively in UN and UNESCO documents, and this meaning is quite close to peace education. However, it is limited to some extent. We have to live in harmony with nature - this is a very important objective for peace education - but there is hardly a relationship to education for international understanding. Global education includes also a dimension related to environmental education and to our habits as consumers. Do we buy our coffee in Third World shops, do we really need window frames made from mahogany out of the tropical rain forests? Global awareness and global values should permeate our everyday values.

9.

AB: In many countries, questions related to disarmament and peace are highly controversial. Would you anticipate any difficulties, for example with parents or other members of the community, when introducing peace education in schools? If so, what kind of difficulties? Do you see any way out of such problems?

HR: Many teachers and heads have experienced difficulties with parents, governors, Local Education Authorities officers or even the press when introducing peace education issues in their schools or classrooms. Speaking about nuclear risks or the interrelationship between the arms race and poverty in the Third World is considered by a lot of people to be related to communist or leftist ideas. And no doubt, I cannot teach about CND's (Campaign for Nuclear Disarmament) policy on unilateral disarmament without mentioning the traditional alternatives to that. Parents are more aware than 20 years ago of what is going on in schools in the field of political education. I would expect some critical comments by parents on peace education

issues, but isn't it a chance for a lively community? There are a lot of teachers who are complaining that parents don't complain to them, but they are directly complaining to the head or the LEA officer.

AB: Could there be some ways out of these difficulties?

HR: I think this is a question of changing attitudes in society, generally speaking. If we had small schools with face-to-face communication and close relationship between pupils, parents and teachers, then probably a better climate, a more trustful atmosphere could arise and could make it possible to speak about controversial issues and subjects more freely, frankly and openly than it is the case today.

10.

AB: What needs to be done in teacher training in order to prepare future teachers more adequately for the area of "peace education"?

HR: Our system of teacher training in Germany and also in Britain and the Netherlands is devoted to specialized subject studies geared to the final examinations. There is too little a training in achieving competence in the general educational field or getting competence in sociological, psychological and philosophical backgrounds. What strongly is needed, I think, is increasing the understanding of the structures of our society; to discuss its problems from sociological, educational and psychological viewpoints as an integrated approach related back to the role of being a teacher. We don't educate politicians or lawyers, we are educating teachers, which means that the problems of society, the problems of the political area for example, should be related back to the question of what role the school should play in a particular society. And teacher training should also emphasize practical aspects of the teaching profession, not only the theoretical subject matter. The framework of the "International Workshops on Peace Education" for student

teachers, for instance, has functioned as a successful instrument to provide students with practical skills as well as theoretical knowledge on the basis of project work. The work of the Teacher Training College Groningen and our experiences at the Department of Education at the Technical University of Berlin have proved the success of long lasting group work, for at least a year. Then close relationship arise, which leads to a climate of confidence between teacher and student, to a climate of warmth and personal relationship, which promotes a more profound educational experience. Even in this case "practice what you preach" is a good help.

11.

AB: Is there anything else that you would like to add about the school and peace education?

HR: Peace education should lose its connotation of a "hot potato" as it has sometimes been seen in British tabloids. Where the whole ethos of a school is dedicated to co-operative values, to participation and dialogue to avoiding ethnocentric attitudes as a source of prejudices and enemy images, then education for peace will find a suitable background for issues on disarmament, environmental damage or human rights. In this respect every peace education is political education which helps students to find their way in today's world or the future reality of society.

NOTES ON THE INTERVIEWEE

Hanns-Fred Rathenow. Professor of education at the Technical University of Berlin, is Deputy Head of the Institute for Social Studies within the Department of Education. (Address: TU Berlin, FB22, Franklinstr. 28/29, 1000 Berlin 10.)

Previously he taught History and Social Studies at a secondary school, and lectured at a College of Higher Education (Pädagogische Hochschule Berlin). He is the author of books and articles of teaching methods in Social Studies and was a visiting professor at the Richardson Institute for Peace Studies (University of Lancaster, UK) in 1983.

Examples of publications

Strukturelle Gewalt und Hausbesetzungen in Berlin - Alternative in der Resignation. DaF - Deutsch als Fremdsprache an niederländischen Schulen, 1983, 4, 26-32.

(With E. Kasten & N.H. Weber.) Friedenserziehung als Aufgabe der Erziehungswissenschaften - Hochschuldidaktische Überlegungen zur Projektarbeit in der Lehrerbildung der TU Berlin. In: Meiser, B. (Ed.) Schule und Lernen - Verlernt und Verschult. Bad Honnef: Bock und Hercken, 1983. Pp. 164-186.

Teachers for Peace: Another enemy within? Hard Times, 1984, 24, 30-34.

(With P. Smoker.) Peace education in Britain: Some results of a survey. Bulletin of Peace Proposals, 1984, 15, 171-184.

(With W. Stammwitz.) Anpassung oder Selbstbestimmung? Die Auseinandersetzung über die Entwürfe für eine KMK-Empfehlung zur Friedenserziehung. In: Reich, B. & Weber, N.H. (Eds.) Unterricht im Dienste des Friedens. Düsseldorf: Schwann, 1984. Pp. 15-31.

(With N.H. Weber.) (Eds.) Friedenstag an Berliner Schulen. Berlin, 1984.

(With N.H. Weber.) Peace education as a task for teacher training at the university. Gandhi Marg: Journal of the Gandhi Peace Foundation (New Delhi), 1984, 6, 380-384.

"... a monumental disaster for education." Der Vorschlag für ein "National Curriculum 5-16" in England and Wales. In: Englisch-Amerikanische Studien, 1987, 9, 595-598.

Friedenserziehung in Staaten West- und Nordeuropas. In: Calließ, J. & Lob, R.E. (Eds.) Handbuch Praxis der Umwelt- und Friedenserziehung. Düsseldorf: Schwann, 1987. Pp. 630-636.

(With S. Steinbach.) Global education. Scope and directions: An interview with David Selby. Geographical Education: Journal of the Australian Geography Teachers Association, 1987, 5(3), 21-24.

(With S. Steinbach.) Person - Planet - School. Neue Tendenzen politischer Bildung in den USA und Großbritannien. Englisch-Amerikanische Studien, 1987, 9, 541-550.

Douglas Ray

1.

AB: As an introduction, could you say a few words about yourself and your interest in the field of "peace education"?

DR: My name is Douglas Ray. I work at the University of Western Ontario in London, Canada, in the faculty of education. All of our students are graduates in arts or sciences and they take a one-year teaching certificate. My own background is as a school teacher, mostly in the social studies, history, economic sociology, and political science. I taught in various schools in Alberta, and I have taught in Scotland as well.

Most of my work in peace education came as a graduate student and particularly as a result of my doctoral work. My first experience with the topic of peace education was in the year 1964, when a group of young people gathered from all over the world in London, England, to discuss peace education. One of the members of the group that I was assigned to was Robin Burns, Australia, who was very important subsequently in connection with peace education. When I was working at the University of London I read several articles by Nicholas Hans, who had been very important in defining the early work of international education and international understanding, and my professor was Joseph A. Lauwerys, who had a great interest in this area. Toward the end of my year at London in 1964, I was asked by the UNESCO Institute for Education in Hamburg to participate in a session in Freiburg, Switzerland on education for international understanding, cooperation and peace. These were my first experiences in the field of peace education.

AB: And your present work?

DR: My present work is at the University of Western

Ontario. Particular groups of students displaying an interest in peace education, for example on Human Rights Day would have some special program. Or when a film related to this area comes out they would try to arrange for every person to see it and have experts comment on it (such as the Helen Caldicott film "If you love this planet"). This is not a compulsory part of the program. Some of the units that I teach in a compulsory part of our program reflect human rights and international obligations for Canada rather than peace as such.

AB: Perhaps you could also say something about the kind of research work that you have reported on here at the Rio conference?

DR: Research work that I have been doing for several years has dealt with international understanding in connection with the UNESCO Associated Schools Program. I have about 20 years experience in this field. More recently I have been working with colleagues in Latin America, dealing with the development of the social studies program for grades 1-7 in Colombia, Peru and Venezuela. We are interested in trying to have something which brings the ordinary person back into history instead of having only the story of big bosses, generals and the giants of commerce and politics. We try to introduce something of the contributions of the ordinary person, the slaves, the aboriginal population, the women, the peasants and so on.

Most recently, I have been working with the Canadian Human Rights Foundation. We discovered that there was very little being done in connection with human rights education in Canadian schools. That did not mean that teachers, parents, school board officials, ministry of education officials, or students were happy with this state of affairs - it was just the reality. They said that somebody should do it and that one should start with the elementary schools. So although the Canadian Human Rights Foundation had never previously done any

work in schools (they had confined their work to adult groups: judges, police chiefs and that sort of thing), they decided to work with school curricula. I chaired a committee set up to develop a curriculum unit in this area for use in the schools.

AB: It would be of interest to hear a little more about your work related to the UNESCO Associated Schools.

DR: UNESCO Associated Schools were introduced in Canada in 1958 or 1959 in Toronto, but it never got beyond a single individual for several years. In 1965 and 1966 it spread to a network of about 30 schools across Canada. I was one of the program directors for this group of schools, and for a period of about five years we had a very active program in which we defined a lot of things in connection with intergroup relations, human rights and development, that should be dealt with in the curriculum. We were successful not only in demonstrating how it might be done in our own schools, but in persuading the Ministries of Education to broaden this so that it was not just dealt with in the 30 schools of which I spoke, but rather it became part of the required curriculum for literally all Canada. This was in the last part of the 1960s. Shortly after that time the Canadian commission for UNESCO wished to go on with other Canadian activities and they deemphasized the UNESCO Associated Schools. They no longer have the same publicity, but many of the persons involved are still doing this kind of work, and in fact some of them were involved in the human rights educational program that I discussed about. We keep a personal network to some extent, and through venues other than the UNESCO Associated Schools many of us do things which are consistent with the ideals of the UNESCO Associated School program.

2.

AB: What do you think of first when you hear the words "peace education"?

DR: Among other things, I think of disarmament education and perhaps education for nuclear disarmament. These were things associated with such persons as Einstein, Bertrand Russell and so on, so we are going back 30 or 40 years in that connection. However, it is quite clear that several other ideas have to be addressed, because you might have an absence of bombs and shooting, but still not have a just world. So peace education in the words of Galtung should deal with positive peace as well, trying to create the conditions where war is less likely or where quarreling is less likely, and where differences of opinion would be dealt with in some more sane manner than shooting at one another. Trying to create the conditions where the necessary changes will be identified and steps will be taken towards carrying them out are very critical in the development of peace, and I think that is part of peace education. Conflict resolution stages have to be addressed, and people have to be persuaded that even if they have the power to impose their will upon the other, they do not have such a right. There has to be a sense of justice in these kinds of decisions, just as we have abandoned duels as the means of resolving conflicts between individuals.

3.

AB: If you think back on your own school days, were there some aspects in your schooling that might be considered an attempt at "peace education"?

DR: I went to school during the second world war, and a great deal of the propaganda of the war time period were dedicated to What in the world are we fighting for? Some of the things which we were said to be fighting for later appeared in the United Nations as objectives for all societies. Among these, of course, was the right to freedom from political persecution.

I thought very much toward the end of my schooling that the cold war was a terrible catastrophe which

perhaps could have been avoided, although I didn't understand how this might have been done. But there was a very dramatic change in the newspapers and other media and the news magazines like Reader's Digest. In the period 1943-1946 or so, they talked of our Soviet comrades and in terms of cooperation. Suddenly by 1948 or so, the Soviets were described as the most ruthless kind of enemy that one could imagine. This development seemed to be completely unnecessary, but noone seemed to know how to arrest this kind of thing. Although I didn't realize it at the time, I guess I was beginning to have some questions to pursue later as a university student.

AB: Would you say that what you now call peace education didn't exist in your school?

DR: I did see some things that were like that. For example, the end of the war was treated with a great deal of symbolic care by a person we very much respected: the principal of our school. He wanted us to remember that day for ever and what it stood for, and he was doing his best to draw from the cultures of all the students to help us share in this feeling, that this was an important moment for all peoples, that perhaps it meant a new beginning. Very quickly thereafter, the Canadian school curriculum changed to an analysis of the war, an analysis of why the war was fought, an analysis of what was possible in order to prevent the mistakes which had led to the war and in particular what would be some of the roles that Canada could play in making sure that this sort of thing never happened. One of the important things which was considered a possible role for Canada, was that we would open our doors to refugees although we had kept them closed in the 1930s and earlier.

One of the more shameful moments for Canada was the refusal to allow Jews from Europe to come to Canada, with very small numbers excepted from this. They were rejected, and in many cases they died in concentration camps. So many in Canada shared a collective repugnance,

a rejection of the country's policies in the past. Similarly, there was an acknowledgement that the Japanese Canadians, Canadians of Japanese descent but Canadians, had been treated in a shameful way and in a way which was very different from persons who were Canadians but of German or Italian descent. It was felt that this could only be attributed to racism. So there was an acknowledgement that our Canadian governments had over a long period of time acted in a shameful way - in a way which contributed to the very symptoms we claimed we had been fighting against in the war, and that our own record would have to change in the future.

4.

AB: Do you believe that schools in your country, as you know them today, contribute to a "peace education"?

DR: It is very difficult to generalize about Canadian schools, because there are ten provinces, each with separate autonomous control over the schools in that province (and two territories which almost reflect two more provinces). Nevertheless, Canadian schools probably are more international than many schools in the world. There has been some attention given to the Canadian role in the world, and since 1945, the Canadian role in the world has not been to be involved much in fighting anywhere else, but to serve the United Nations, usually as a peacekeeper rather than as a peacemaker. Canadians were involved to some degree in Korea in a more combatant role, but other than that they have been like the Scandinavian countries, India or Poland, involved principally as non-combatants trying to negotiate between hostile groups in various troubled spots of the world.

There has been a good deal of pride that Canada has been able to do this, and we realize that we could because Canada has not been tied very closely to any of the great power blocs.

I would not say that we have consciously pursued

peace education, but several aspects of Canadian typical social studies programs, especially of the senior high school level, would definitely contribute to a better understanding of global conditions and probably of Canadian opportunities and our traditions in trying to deal with some of these opportunities and challenges.

AB: Are there some specific schools that are dealing more directly with peace education?

DR: One school might be mentioned, although it is not really a Canadian school, but an international school: Lester B. Pearson College of the Pacific. It is located just outside Victoria, British Columbia, and it has about 200 students, age 17 and 18. This school pursues the international baccalaureat. The students are drawn from something like 16 or 17 countries, and the program is devised to deal with world rather than national problems, to have an international student body, an international faculty and a great many resources from other countries. They deal in two or three languages with most issues, and they stimulate the students to deal with ways in which the abstractions of lessons can be made more concrete by taking some kind of social action in the communities in Canada. One critical point in connection with this Lester B. Pearson College is that Canada really does not control who the students are. They are nominated by some committees in other countries, and I suspect that it is a very elite group. It's probably influential in the long run, however, because many of these elite persons will later become government officials and so on and therefore the experience is not wasted, but it should not to be considered an ordinary school at all. It is a Rolls Royce of schooling opportunities.

5.

AB: Do you think it is at all possible for schools to contribute to a "peace education"? If so, what are some of the steps and measures to be taken that you think of first?

DR: I think that it is possible. If it is not possible for schools to have an impact on peace education, I do not know what agency in society can be counted on to do the job. I recognize it is very difficult for the schools to do it. It is very easy for us to take on more than we can do, to promise more than we can do and therefore disappoint. But I think for us to bow out on that account is unnecessary and probably foolish. Probably the schools are the best agency in society to undertake this task. In the first place we deal with the total population, and we do deal with them at a period in their lives when their ideas are to some extent malleable. We do not have more influence on them than their parents. We do not have more influence perhaps than their peers. But we do have some influence.

I think it is really very important that we should try this. We are probably unnecessarily reluctant; the idea that we are going to promote a particular kind of society would be regarded by many educators as propaganda, and propaganda is a very bad word. On the other hand, I think propaganda is not necessarily different in kind from advertising in any other sense. We advertise to try to get people to buy this or that product. We might advertise similarly to try to get people to believe that peace is a good idea. We certainly do advertise to try to promote health, more exercise, better control and that sort of thing. More fundamental than any of these kinds of things is to try to live a life which will enable us as a human species to survive on this planet. If that is not an important matter to use propaganda for - I don't know what is.

AB: What would then be some of the steps and measures to be taken concretely that you come to think of?

DR: I think one of the most important things is to avoid preaching, talking in abstractions. We have to try to get some kinds of steps that kids can become aware of and can take action in - where they can see the difference

and realize that it is worth while to try to do this sort of thing. Thus, for example, we can help them to realize that their society is racist or sexist, and that they have a personal responsibility in transforming this. We can show them some new forms of behaviour that they could follow, some new ways of checking their behaviour to see whether or not they have overcome these problems and perhaps to commend them on the progress to help them to participate in this evaluation and transformation of persons who do not follow the code of behaviour which we are to follow.

The way in which this seems most possible to me, is to have the children participate in the government of their school to some extent. Very often we shy away from this, because we realize that kids will not have the same ideas in every sense as we do, and yet it seems likely that many of their ideas will be in fact ahead of ours. We are a little bit too conservative sometimes - unwilling to take some of the steps.

Let me take an example from the Human Rights Education Program which is introduced in grade 4, to students age 9 or 10. We were interested in developing three inter-related concepts: rights, responsibilities and reasonable limitations on these rights. The way in which we worked with this in the schools was to have the kids draw up a class Charter of Rights. They did this by taking a look at, for example, what are the things that you think a person needs in order to survive physically? They would put down things like food, the right to go to the bathroom, the right to sleep and the right to exercise and so on. Then, they noted that these were the same for boys and girls, the same for kids who were disabled or not, the same for kids of different races. Then: What do people need in terms of psychological considerations? Again the children found: Yes, they need love, affection, attention, recognition and so on, and again they noted that all kids need these kinds of things. There are no

sex or race or age differences.

Then when they began drawing up their class Charter of Rights, when they began writing out suggestions, everything was challenged. The teacher said: If you claim it to be a right, you cannot deny that right to anybody else, so if you are going to say: I have the right to the toilet whenever I like, you have to recognize that everybody in this class have that right. The kids quickly began thinking in more differentiated terms; in some cases it is a wish perhaps, but not a right. It is a claim which is not realistic. It has to be subject to a reasonable limitation or I am not willing to accept my responsibility to give to other persons the same right, so the kids quickly became more realistic in their grouping of rights. However, the list of rights which were developed in a particular class, was perhaps not obtained outside that class; in other classes the list might be different. When they went home their parents might not accept that same list. But the children began understanding the relationship between their responsibilities, the question of reasonable limits and rights. And I think that we have to understand that the rights of a Swedish child are not the same as the rights of a Tanzanian child for a variety of reasons. Maybe they should be. But you cannot impose from Sweden the rights on even a neighbouring state and you certainly can not on more distant states. Neither can you blame another society for failing to provide certain rights that you take for granted in Sweden. As early as at age 8, 9 or 10, you can understand some of these concepts, and I think it is important to continue to elaborate on such examples.

6.

AB: What would be some of the possible differences in peace education approaches among younger and older students in schools?

DR: With younger students I think you try to tie your examples to their community to a greater extent, to the familiar things. Older students have had an opportunity to read more widely, to see more television, to meet people from other parts of the world, perhaps to travel. They have a better understanding that this is a big and complex world, and you can deal with the abstractions better. You don't have to spend as much time building up the background, because they already have quite a lot of that.

I think too that because of the children's maturation, for example, younger pupils are probably not so interested in the question of sex, while older students may be almost pre-occupied with this matter. So your discrimination examples might deal in younger students with relationships among playmates, whereas older students might be thinking in terms of potential marriage partners. You might be thinking also in terms of regulations of the labour force with older students, because they are coming closer to entry in the labor market.

I think that it is possible to begin peace education or human rights education very early. However, probably the essential limitations are: What can the kids understand when presented in the format in which we are presenting it? Very often, if we can find a different format, they can understand ideas which we think are too complex for them.

AB: What do you think about the specific information about what war means or what nuclear war might mean? To what extent and in what form should that be included, and for what ages?

DR: Surely children by the age of four or five are quite conversant with violence. Many of their toys, particularly I think boys' toys, deal with violence. There are guns and planes and things like that. Many of the games that they play deal with make-believe death and I suppose that many of them are familiar from their reading with stories of war and heroism. They perhaps empathize with

some aspects of this - the heroism, the gallantry, the glory. They don't have a good understanding of, through the type of reading typically made available through the media to kids, the horrors of war. My concern is that kids are likely grow up with a very mistaken notion of war. War is not something where you point your finger or a toy-gun at a person and yell: Bang! The person falls down and five minutes later he is playing again. War isn't like that! The kids have to realize that war in the adult world means kids going off, perhaps never again to return. They are not likely to become aware of this aspect of war until they start, probably at the age of twelve or thereabout, studying the reality of war in our society today. It may come about through the schools or through other agencies, but I think kids do have to realize that war is a deadly, very very serious business.

I think they also have to realize that often it is started for the flimsiest of excuses. There is a silly war in European history which was fought, because a person had an ear chopped off. The war of revenge was called The War of Jenkin's Ear. In reality many of our wars are fought for that kind of flimsy excuses. We need to help the kids realize that there are other and better ways of resolving disputes than going at one another with bayonets and bombs; and we have to deal with the successes of alternative solutions. An example in the Scandinavian countries is the resolution of how the peoples of Norway and Sweden should govern themselves which was in dispute by the turn of the century. In some cases a similar type of dispute probably would have led to war. In this case it led to a resolution which is more or less satisfactory to all parties and certainly has not left two bitter enemies.

Most types of disputes have losers and perhaps both sides have to remember that it is important to lose a little bit and not win completely if it is to

be a just solution. Kids I think can understand this kind of thing and we can help them through various types of games, where they take the perspective of different countries trying to solve problems of society. In a semi-realistic way, they thereby acquire something of the feeling of what it is like to have this kind of an agenda to deal with. If they fail to be able to take another's perspective, I think they remain immature and unable to understand these types of quarrels and the reasons why they are so difficult in many cases to resolve.

7,

AB: If you were an upper-secondary school teacher in a subject with which you are particularly familiar, how would you like to make the students more conscious of and more prepared for problems of peace, within that subject?

DR: I taught social studies in Alberta for 15 years, and the way in which I usually taught these kind of themes was by dealing with general principles with specific examples from history and I tried to involve the kids in an analysis of current international society to try to discover parallels or perhaps opposites that could be instructive. I think it is critical in this kind of work to try to make sure that you have a global assessment of society as opposed to a purely parochial interpretation. Very often our schools perpetuate the knowledge of our immediate communities, perhaps of our nation or our nation and its near allies and perhaps they will have a boogy, an enemy - make-believe enemy in some cases - in addition to that, but for much of the rest of the world, there is a vast silence.

I think it is absolutely critical for a child growing up in the late 90s and living most of their lives after 2000 that they should think in terms of a global society and that they should have a significant amount of knowledge about representative examples from different parts of that global society. Therefore it is critical

that we should include in as responsible and in as respectful a way as possible a significant number of examples from other cultures. For example, I believe that it is critically important for Canadian children to learn something about India, China, the Soviet Union, one or two African countries, one or two Latin American countries, one or two European countries and the United States - in addition to Canada. I would think that in Sweden, a similar group of countries might be identified; they would vary from the list that I described, but the principles, I think, might be the same. I think that it is important not to compartmentalize knowledge too much. To try to open doors with the knowledge, to help kids realize how a particular event is related to the overall scheme of things and not deal with matters as isolated exotic pieces of information but rather to fit them always into a coherent pattern. Global education, peace education, international understanding - these are labels which indicate mechanisms by which this kind of coherent pattern might emerge.

8.

AB: In international debates, the terms "disarmament education" and "peace education" have been used, in addition to some other related terms ("global education", "education for international understanding" etc.). Do you have any comments and preferences as to this terminology?

DR: Because of the work that I am now doing, I prefer to use the word "human rights education" as a generic, all embracing kind of umbrella term. To me "human rights education" includes the right to life. Disarmament education and peace education involve essentially the right to life. In the case of peace education the right to justice should be included and that is dealt with in several aspects of human rights education. The idea of conflict resolution in a non-violent way I think is consistent with human rights

education. Global education might extend beyond human rights education as typically conceived, particularly because it has more of a scientific and environmental context. The only way in which human rights can get at this, is to talk about how the present generation of people on the earth should be custodian, having a responsibility to the future. The rights of future generations give us the responsibilities to ensure that they will survive in that future.

Education for international understanding is now an archaic term. You must deal with education for understanding among peoples, but the problem with the term international is the emphasis on nation. We have to deal with differences among people, whether these differences are identified with language, religion, race, nation, or any other form of distinction. These types of distinctions are essentially arbitrary, they are associated with important cultural differences in many cases, but nevertheless these cultural differences are not necessary to the existence of the human being. Therefore it's terribly important for kids to look at the relationships at both the personal and the global level, but the nation level is only one of many possible groupings, and we should not over-emphasize that.

As to the term disarmament education, I think that disarmament (if nothing more is done) is a very partial solution. It does not deal adequately with conflict resolution, and it does not deal adequately with the removal of injustices. By removing one of the means by which conflicts might be resolved, you do not necessarily promote resolution. So disarmament education is highly desirable, but unless a lot of the other things take place at the same time, it is completely inadequate.

9.

AB: In many countries, questions related to disarmament and peace are highly controversial. Would you expect some difficulties, for example with parents or other members of the community, when introducing peace education in schools? If so, what kind of difficulties? Do you see any way out of such problems?

DR: On various occasions in Canada, there have been these types of problems. One of the most important has to deal with the duty of every male citizen serving the armed forces. Under what circumstances is it considered appropriate for a person to say: I do not wish to serve, I want to be a conscientious objector? At one time, a conscientious objector was considered to be a coward by many Canadians. More recently, I think, this is not seen as a major problem. Conscientious objectors in Canadian law are required to fulfil their duties to society in some other way than as military service, and since Canada has not recently been at war, there is no particular difficulty in dealing with other means than serving in combat as a way of serving your country.

There probably are important problems for some members of our Canadian society when certain solutions to problems are proposed. For example, one group in our Canadian society would like to have holocaust education within the schools. There is immediately a problem. Which holocausts are you going to refer to? This promotes a great deal of acrimonious debate. If you discuss holocaust education, what do you do about the inevitable labelling and criticism of groups responsible for the holocausts? Related groups in Canadian society who are not personally responsible in any way for the holocaust feel that they are being criticized unfairly, and that it should not be done. Canada has a particularly severe problem in this respect because most of the countries in the world have significant numbers of migrants who have come to Canada. It's an extremely cosmopolitan country, and it is no longer possible to have the views

of one group imposed upon all of the others.

AB: And how would you deal such problems?

DR: I think I would deal with them as a general problem.

For example, when considering the question of holocaust education, I would deal with the problem of discrimination. Discrimination exists in all societies, and it exists at various levels. A low level of discrimination may mean something like you will not call a particular person your friend because of his or her membership of such and such a group. At a higher level, you might not employ that person because of his or her membership in such and such a group, and at still higher levels you might exclude them come to your country. At the most serious level, you would put them to death, you would exterminate them, and there would be a holocaust. We have in recent history a number of holocausts which might be identified, but I think that if there are only two events that should be dealt with from the second world war, they are, first the Nazi holocausts of Jews, Gipsies and many others, and secondly the atomic bomb. Most other aspects of World War II are indistinguishable from the kind of things that happen in most wars. You have heroism and you have agony. You have suffering on an unprecedented scale, but nevertheless this was not different in kind, but only in numbers involved. The two things which were different in kind were the holocaust by the Nazis and the use of the atomic bomb. For those reasons I would emphasize those particular events from World War II.

10.

AB: What needs to be done in teacher training in order to prepare future teachers more adequately for the area of "peace education"?

DR: I think we have a very serious problem in asking teachers to be informed on all things, so what we need to do is to provide them with strategies rather than with detailed prescriptions on content. I have seen lists of the things which a good teacher should be able to do. The list alone would occupy several pages, and it would

take half a life time in order for a person to become proficient in all those areas. I have met personally only two or three persons that I consider to be competent in all of those fields, and I think it is absolutely unrealistic for us to expect this for all the teachers or even all of the teachers of social sciences or history. What we have to propose is: These are a limited number of realistic and important objectives. We would like you to make sure that they are incorporated properly into your program, and we must make sure that there are resources which the teachers can draw upon and examples with which they are familiar. We also have to make use of the interests the kids have in a particular community and be aware of what might promote undesirable reactions in that community. So I think that the consideration of what does the teacher know, what does the community expect or tolerate, what are the kids interested in may be the three points on which I would try to hang a program in teacher training.

AB: Does the regular teacher training in your country involve some peace education at the present time?

DR: It involves some peace education for a small number of teachers, but not for the majority. I think that some aspects of peace education should be familiar to all teachers in the primary schools, because it is typical there for one teacher to teach almost all of the subjects in the school. In the secondary schools it is usual in Canada to have subject-matter specialization, and there I think it would be appropriate for only the teachers who are directly involved in the social sciences and history to be required to have a considerable information on peace education. However, it would be a mistake if we were to exclude (for example) the chemistry and physics teacher from any mention of peace education in their subject, because in a number of areas a use of science in the service of peace or war is critical.

I think another point that might be mentioned in

connection with teacher training is: We should do more to try to make it possible and even likely that many of our teachers would have experience of another culture, if possible, in another country. Whether this is done as part of their teacher training or as part of their early teacher experience by exchanges of persons might be less important. I think the experience of actually living in another country for a period of time is much more important than merely studying about something in a book. This may be particularly important also for administrators, because the notion that our way of dealing with problems are the right ways or the best ways is seriously open to doubt. Particularly for persons who are administering schools some kind of international experience, preferably in a school in another country or in a university abroad, I think would be a very important qualification for good administrators.

11.

AB: Is there anything else that you would like to add about the school and peace education?

DR: I think that one of the most important considerations in all education is: Who shall teach? The way in which this is typically resolved takes three forms. One is the personal decision of youth or sometimes older persons, that they would like to become teachers. The second important thing is the decision on who would be admitted to faculties of education. The third thing is: Who are to be hired to do a particular job? At each of these decision-points there is an opportunity to address the problems of peace education. If a person is interested in the welfare of society and they show this as a student in their school, we should encourage this person in every possible way to think about being in one of the service professions like teaching. We should perhaps make it possible for them - if not otherwise possible - to take necessary training and other steps to become a teacher. We should make sure

that financial barriers are not so serious that suitable persons must do something else in order to meet their obligations to their family. When dealing with who shall enter the faculties of education or normal schools or who should be hired, we probably should give far more attention to the social awareness and ambitions of the interested persons instead of focusing only on their health or academic achievements. What kind of a person are they? I realize that this may lead you into difficult debates, because you impose criteria which you cannot demonstrate to be clearly related to teacher success. But at least we should seriously discuss broader criteria that we traditionally have used.

NOTES ON THE INTERVIEWEE

Douglas Ray. Born in 1932 in Canada, was a school teacher for 15 years. After taking a Ph.D. at the University of London, he became a professor of education at the University of Western Ontario, London, Canada. He has consulted on Education for International Understanding, developed curriculum in Canada and Latin America, and researched cultural differences of different types. His current interests are comparative education, human rights education, and education for cultural sensitivity.
- Office address: Faculty of Education, The University of Western Ontario, London, Canada N6G 1G7.

Examples of publications

Human rights in Canadian education. Dubuque, IA: Kendall Hunt, 1983.

Values, lifelong education and an aging Canadian population. London, Canada: Third Eye, 1984.

Resources for education: Human rights and the Canadian system. Canadian Journal of Education, 1985, 11(3), 353-363.

Among official language, minority language and multi-cultural programmes in Canada. Bildung und Erziehung, 1986, 39(1), 17-31.

(With N.B. Tarrow.) Assessing a rolling policy reform: Rights for women and children in modern China. Canadian and International Education, 1986, 15(2), 53-87.

(With B. Franco.) Human rights in education: Recently published Canadian sources and an index. Canadian Journal of Education, 1986, 11(3), 364-382.

Emerging issues in human rights education. In: Stewin, L. & McCann, S. (Eds.) Canadian educational issues. Toronto: Copp Clark Pitman, 1987. Pp. 50-61.

Evaluating international curriculum development: Cooperation and self-reliance in the social studies of Peru, Colombia and Venezuela, ERIC ED 284 807, 1987.

(With N.B. Tarrow.) Human rights and education: An overview. In: Tarrow, N.B. (Ed.) Human rights and education. Oxford: Pergamon, 1987. Pp. 3-16.

Human rights and educational policies. McGill Journal of Education, 1988, 23(2), 1-9.

Peace education: Canadian and international perspective. London, Canada: Third Eye, 1988.

Human rights: Is Canadian schooling a privilege, a right or an obligation? McGill Journal of Education, 1989, 24(2), 143-158.

Paul Smoker

1.

AB: As an introduction, could you say a few words about yourself and your interest in the field of "peace education"?

PS: I came into peace research or peace studies in 1960. At the time I was studying to be a physicist, but I figured the world had enough physicists working with nuclear weapons. We were mainly concerned about the nuclear issue, so a group of us got together and started a peace research center in Lancaster in 1960. Initially, the motivation was the worry about nuclear war.

AB: Could you tell me a little more about your center?

PS: At that time a number of institutes had recently started: The Peace Research Institute in Oslo, The Center for Research on Conflict Resolution in Michigan; and the whole movement was just beginning to get going: The Journal of Conflict Resolution, The Journal of Peace Research. At that time - in Britain at least - nobody would have suggested doing peace studies in the university, and the idea of peace education in schools would have been considered quite ludicrous, communistic or unthinkable, I suppose in the same way as sex education in school would have been considered earlier. Over a period, however, the academic peace studies movement, the peace research movement developed, and now the center I work at is an established part of the University of Lancaster.

When the University of Lancaster came to be established in Lancaster, in 1965, we had an independent center going for five years, supported by pacifists, Quakers, peace movements, churches and others. The first Vice Chancellor of that university happened to be a Quaker who had been a conscientious objector during the Second World War, Charles Carter - now Sir Charles Carter.

He was also interested in the work of Richardson, and I had been working on Richardson's mathematical models at the peace research center in Lancaster. I used to make my living by playing the piano in a pub at week-ends, and during the week I would work on my peace research extending Richardson's models of arms race.

As a result of Charles Carter's initiative, we moved into the University and we've had a peace study program at Lancaster University ever since. It was the first university in Britain to include it in its program. It has always been a very small program with a small undergraduate course and with a small number of graduate research students doing masters or Ph.D's.

We are still supported mainly by the peace movement. We have "Friends of the Richardson Institute" - and there is about 170 of those; they are a mixture of Quaker meetings, churches, peace groups and some trusts and foundations, and they provide most of the money to support the institute. The university provides us with rooms, computer time and so on. We are still a very small institute.

2.

AB: What do you think of first when you hear the words "peace education"?

PS: In England, many people think differently about "peace education" and "education for peace". People who talk about "peace education" generally are talking about conveying a better understanding of theories, of information, of facts about problems of peace and war - it's an intellectual type of approach to the topic, which is the one that for the most part we have to adopt in universities and we do adopt in the university.

However, many people speak about "education for peace", and they think about having people in school get used to peace as a natural living experience in the classroom, focusing on the educational process,

the pedagogical principles involved. My own personal bias is towards that approach, and in a perfect world that is the approach I would like to do. I have been trained as a teacher, and I was then a student of the methods of A.S. Neill. I believed in his approach to education, with its emphasis on democratic experience in the classroom situation. But unfortunately, since we work in a less than ideal world, these principles are often difficult to carry out, for example, at the university although, in my own institute, we do discuss things, treat each other as equals, and as much as possible we try to take each others' views into account; it's not a hierarchical operation. So when I think about peace education, I think about these two different approaches to it and the advantages and disadvantages of both.

Recently we had to develop a syllabus for use in schools in Britain, a peace studies syllabus. It was a major break-through to get the examination bodies to consider that they could include such a syllabus in a curriculum for schools. The Joint Matriculation Board had agreed to do this. I've been working upon this project for about five years now - it took us some years to persuade them that this was a legitimate intellectual exercise, and now we are putting together a syllabus. This is "peace education", because the syllabus says nothing about how the teaching should be conducted in the classroom, about the spirit in the classroom, about the participation of students, but it talks about content. And obviously I personally am not terribly happy about that; but on the other hand, I realize that it would be quite impossible for me to get the Joint Matriculation Board to agree to the other approach, and I would rather have this than nothing.

There are many teachers who do not agree with this. They take the view that, in fact, peace education in this academic sense is not a good idea and are quite

strongly opposed to it. They argue that it gives a false idea of what the peace process is really about - that the peace process is really about good, personal relationships, about participating in the classroom, about democratic participation in life. They feel that the hidden curriculum involved in teaching peace, as if it were physics, is doing a disservice. I respect that view and in fact part of me, unfortunately, agrees with that. So I have mixed feelings about this. But on the other hand I do think there is a merit indeed in knowledge and intellectual understanding about problems of peace and war regardless of the way the classroom is organized.

3.

AB: If you think back on your own school days, were there some aspects in your schooling that might be considered an attempt at "peace education"?

PS: The grammar school I went to was a boy's school, a single sex school, and in my school it was expected that every boy joined the Combined Cadet Force - an Army training corps. In theory, it was not compulsory, but in fact it was; because it was the social-cultural norm that everybody joined in. It trained the boys to shoot rifles and introduced them into the military world. Of course, I joined quite unthinkingly. I am sure that the people who ran that saw it as a type of peace education, because they believed in peace through strength.

Then when I got involved with the peace movement I simply left. Unfortunately, at that time I was a chief cadet - I was the leading cadet - and this created an enormous upset in the school, because nobody had ever done this before. The fact that the chief cadet would leave the army corps, saying that he did not want to learn how to kill people any more came as a bit of a shock. So it could be that the training they gave in education was better than they thought -

but not from their point of view!

4.

AB: Do you believe that schools in your country, as you know them today, contribute to a "peace education"?

PS: Fortunately, I was involved in a project with Hanns-Fred Rathenow, where we did a survey of all the 125 local education authorities in the United Kingdom. Subsequently, we have had a graduate student, Alison Vickers, working on peace education, and she and I worked together on peace education in schools, trying to look at the attitudes of different teachers to the problem. So I have a certain amount of knowledge of what's going on in, at least in some of the schools, although I don't think anybody has a full understanding of what's going on across the board.

From that work with Alison Vickers and the work previously with Hanns-Fred Rathenow, I would say there are a number of schools in Britain who are doing quite a lot in the peace education area. If we just talk about peace education, that is, the approach where people are trying to convey facts, theories, understanding about problems of peace, we see that some teachers don't do this in classes which are called peace education. They may do this in lessons which are on civics, on religious education, on current affairs, history, geography, or a number of different other areas. A number of teachers argue that because of problems of time tabling (there are too many subjects already) or because of political problems (if they would say that they were teaching peace education, they would be severely reprimanded), they prefer to tackle the issues involved in peace education through the traditional disciplines, which are taught in the classroom. We found that roughly two to one take that view (of the sample we have looked at). There are also those who argue that there should be a specific subject called peace education.

When we looked at the sample of local education

authorities, we found, I think, well over 60 % that said that either peace education or the topics covered by peace education were included in their schools, and our subsequent follow-up work in talking to teachers in different schools, showed, I think, that this is a fairly accurate figure. So I think that peace education is now alive in British schools anyway.

Its content varies from place to place. Obviously in Northern Ireland, for example, it tends to be more an emphasis upon the local conflict in Northern Ireland. In other parts of the country it might concentrate on some local community issues; it doesn't always concentrate on nuclear weapons, for example, or the relationships between states; it may look at conflict resolution related to a dispute between two sections of the community. Then it overlaps I think with multi-cultural education. But I think that it is fair to say that it has become now established in many British schools.

AB: What about the present attitude of the government?

PS: The government's public position is that they are very hostile to the notion of peace studies. It has been criticized in the House of Commons on a number of occasions by conservative MPs. For example, this advanced level syllabus we are developing has been attacked by a number of conservative MPs on the radio, even though they haven't seen the syllabus. Nobody has seen the syllabus yet, because we have spent a lot of time making sure that this syllabus is intellectually defensible. It is an intellectually defensible syllabus, and the members of the Joint Matriculation Board stand by it. They are also very anxious to maintain their independence in selecting topics they consider to be intellectually sound.

However, although the government is very hostile to peace studies in their public statements, it has helped establish peace studies in Northern Ireland in the New University of Ulster. This was because they are

anxious that peace studies in Northern Ireland should concentrate on the Irish problem. So there is a clear ambivalence in their attitude: On the one hand peace studies are seen as a communist plot or as leftist biased teaching, and on the other peace studies in Northern Ireland receives some support. In general, the government still is pretty hostile, but less than it was. It was worse about four or five years ago.

5.

AB: Do you think it is at all possible for schools to contribute to a "peace education"? If so, what are some of the steps and measures to be taken that you think of first?

PS: I do think it's possible if we are using the word peace education in a sense of imparting knowledge, understanding, theories about peace and conflict. The steps that can be taken depend in large part on the nature of the educational system. In Britain, qualifications are important. (I personally don't like qualifications. There is a hierarchical aspect of this which I find unpleasant. I feel people should study because they are interested in the topic.) But I recognize that in Britain qualifications are very important and it works two ways. Students benefit, and the subject itself benefits if a course is certified. So it is useful to have a course validated, accepted by an independent neutral examination board. So in the British context, I think that that's the sort of thing that schools can do.

But then of course there is the problem of teacher training. Teachers are so pushed, they are asked to do so much. My experience, which is limited, is that most teachers are very conscientious and very professional; they try to do their very best with the resources available. I think one of the problems for schools in introducing peace education is providing the teachers with adequate materials and with training-

courses. I think the colleges of education and other such groups would be the ideal people to do this type of thing, to keep teachers informed about the subject and to help develop good materials that they can then use in the classroom situation.

AB: If you think of the steps and measures within the classroom that the individual teacher could do - what comes to your mind first?

PS: There are a lot of things that can be done. The ideal would be, of course, if you had teachers who had done a course in a Teacher Training College in this area and prepared themselves for such activities.

AB: When you started answering this question, I noted that you said: It is possible if you think of imparting knowledge, understanding etc. What about the other aspect - education for peace: Do you see this as possible also?

PS: That becomes controversial. Now I think, again in the British experience, that this is much more possible at the junior level. I was trained as a teacher to teach primarily younger children - children under the age of 11, and I prefer that. One of the reasons I prefer that was because I was allowed to do educationally interesting things, experimental work, experiential learning, group work. In Britain a lot of work has been done for education for peace: the Bristol project, the Avon project and others, and I think that it is still possible to do this at the younger level.

When you get to the older level this becomes very difficult to do in the official state schools. You can do it in special schools such as Summerhill, where related work has been done for about 40 or 50 years now. But in most state schools you would not be able to do this, partly because of the structure (most schools are primarily hierarchical, students are not part of the decision-making process etc.), partly because of political reasons (if you were trying to

do this, I think there would be an enormous amount of pressure on the teacher to stop doing it). I regret that very much because I actually feel that these two approaches can go along together perfectly well, and I prefer to do both.

6.

AB: What would be some of the possible differences in peace education approaches among younger and older students in schools? You might just have touched upon that.

PS: Yes, in a way. Because of the political and structural situation it is easier to use education for peace approaches among younger children. But I don't think that this is an intrinsic difference. I think the educational processes, if you are 10 years old or 90 years old, are essentially very similar. I personally and in an ideal world believe in the same education for peace approach at all levels and in society at large. But this is not the way the world is and therefore one tries to compromise and move the world in that direction.

7.

AB: If you were an upper-secondary school teacher in a subject with which you are particularly familiar, how would you like to make the students more conscious of and more prepared for problems of peace, within that subject? You talked of that you studied to be a physicist?

PS: Yes, but in school I used to teach mathematics and art. With art, I think I did make a genuine attempt to do this. I think one can use art to approach the problems of images of peace. If I was teaching art in school, I think that's one of the things I would do: I would - as I have done with students who have been doing Ph.D.s - go into the classroom and ask children to paint a picture of what their image of peace is.

Others would be requested to paint a picture of what their image of war is. You usually get a very revealing set of pictures in this way, related to male and female differences in the socializing process. So I think, if I was teaching art in a school, that's one of the things I would do. Art can also be used as a method for individual exploration in a therapeutic fashion. - If I was teaching mathematics, then I would try to introduce statistics at a global level and try to give the students a better picture of the planet as a whole in terms of, for example, the inequalities among people.

8.

AB: In international debates, the terms "disarmament education" and "peace education" have been used, in addition to some other related terms ("global education", "education for international understanding" etc.). Do you have any comments and preferences as to this terminology?

PS: Personally not a lot; no. I understand often why people use one term instead of another, and quite often this is because of the political context, the social context or the cultural context within which they are operating. I think it's very important to respect that so I try to be sensitive to that. If people are talking about global education rather than peace education, it may be to avoid a hostile reaction from other people that could actually interfere with the educational process.

AB: When you talk about this in your institute, what terms do you usually use?

PS: We teach a course in peace studies and it's called peace studies, and this is agreed to by the university. We also have strategic studies, we have defence studies, so if we didn't have peace studies, the place would look like it was run by the army. I am an old-time liberal in the sense that I believe you should be able

to teach anything at universities; there should be no taboos. Therefore I have defended my friends who teach defence studies and are paid by the British Defence Department. I personally don't agree with their view-point, but I agree absolutely with their right to have defence studies at the university.

9.

AB: In many countries, questions related to disarmament and peace are highly controversial. Would you expect some difficulties, for example with parents or other members of the community, when introducing peace education in schools? If so, what kind of difficulties? Do you see any way out of such problems?

PS: Yes, people do have difficulties if they are introducing peace education in schools. It's a hot potato. The difficulties are mainly caused by parents or politicians or members of the press who argue that peace education is biased, whereas other education is not. Now, I happen to believe that all education is biased; you show me unbiased education, and I will show you a square circle. I think that one can have an educational system in which many different biases are represented, and I am in favour of that, but I am unashamedly biased towards peace, avoidance of violence, elimination of structural violence and so forth. I think that it is wrong to defend peace education by saying it's neutral, as some people do. It is biased, but so is the teaching of all social subjects. Education is not independent of values and ethics. The thing is to get a good range of biases, and then people can decide for themselves. And that's my answer how to get out of the problems.

10.

AB: What needs to be done in teacher training in order to prepare future teachers more adequately for the area of "peace education"?

PS: Well, I think we have touched upon that. I think there is a big need for teacher training colleges to develop a number of courses and approaches, both for "peace education" and for "education for peace". When I went to teacher college, I was very lucky in going to a new college that was very committed to the activity and participation approaches which I view as an integral part of education for peace. I think teacher colleges can develop teaching materials and try them out in classrooms, and make them widely available. They can provide things such as day courses, weekend courses, up-grading courses so that the teachers get introduced to this area. I am hoping this is going to happen in Britain, for example, when we get our A-level course ready.

AB: At the present time, what is the situation in teacher training? Are there plenty of courses of these types?

PS: No, there isn't. You could find an odd course here and there. The peace study center at St. Martins College, where David Hicks gave such courses, has recently closed.

AB: Why was that closed?

PS: A lack of support, generally. David Hicks has done wonderfully to maintain it for so long, in spite of difficult circumstances. So I think it is really important for the teacher training colleges to do what they can for peace education.

11.

AB: In many schools, the students represent a variety of nationalities and cultural backgrounds. To what extent would it be possible to use this fact as an aid in education for peace? Would you expect some difficulties in doing so?

PS: I think it can be used in that way. For example, in places like Bradford where there are many people from India or Sri Lanka and Pakistan, the problems of multi-cultural education and developing an educational

system for a multi-cultural society really become very sharp problems, and I think that these cultural problems really could be turned into cultural advantages. The diversity of the different cultures means that you have a much richer educational environment. I don't think it's just a question of "using" - I think it's a genuine and important part of peace education to help people from different cultural backgrounds not only to live together, but also to respect and honour each others' cultural traditions, which are equally valid. I think that it is a very important task for peace education. I would think it would be difficult, because there are enormous problems of racism, for example, and lack of adequate teaching materials. It may be difficult for teachers to deal with these problems because they may not be sufficiently conversant with the different cultural traditions of the students. It may be very demanding.

12.

AB: Sometimes the term "global survival" is used to refer to an area dealing both with the risks of nuclear war and with the risks of far-reaching environmental damage through pollution and overuse of resources. How do you look upon dealing with these two categories of risks together in school? Do you have any suggestions as to how the teacher could approach the problem area of environmental damage?

PS: Partly, I think, this depends upon the particular historical period. At the present time, it would be much easier for a teacher to deal with the problems of environmental damage in schools in Britain than it would be to deal with the problems of the risk of a nuclear war. And this is because the media and the newspapers currently are very concerned and focused on the problems in the environment. At the present time the problems of a nuclear war are just not featured in the media - it's no longer a problem in

the eyes of the media. Therefore, when children go home and see the television and the newspapers, they are getting environmental messages loud and clear, and therefore at the present time, I think it would be very easy to deal with that.

But linking it with nuclear war should also be done as part of the educational process, through such things as the consequences of what would happen with a nuclear war. The students should be aware of the environmental changes, climatic changes, the nuclear winter notion and so forth. They also need to deal with the idea of human beings and their relationship to nature and the ethical questions related to this, such as whether it is defensible to threaten to destroy millions of animals as well using nuclear weapons.

AB: You have yourself worked with the concept of accidental nuclear war. Would that be something that you also could think of using in school?

PS: I certainly would. In the A-level course that we introduce, we have a section dealing with the nuclear issue which looks at the history of the development of nuclear weapons, how strategy about nuclear weapons is developed, and the arguments for and against nuclear weapons. In the arguments against nuclear weapons we include the notion that there is a risk of very serious accident. Can you justify the present policy given the nature of the risk. Yes, I certainly would include those, because I still feel that this is a very serious problem. The problem of an accidental nuclear war is at the present time more serious than the problem of deliberate nuclear war. It may change if we have nuclear proliferation. Then maybe a deliberate nuclear war could once again become a major problem. At the present time we have included this in our A-level course.

In the past, in all the peace studies courses I have taught, I have always included both the nuclear issue and the environmental issue. I have been doing

that for at least 20 years now, and it's essential because both of them have to do with quality of life and both affect the number of people who die on the planet. The number of people from the third world who are starving to death is appalling, and this is an environmental problem, it's a food problem, and a distribution problem, but it's also a problem of the way we organize society, so the interdependence of peace and environmental issue is nothing new, as most of us know who worked in this field, and it will continue to be included in peace study courses. Many of the peace studies courses now include the global issues and obviously, have to deal with global survival. Major questions are: What do we do in order for this planet to survive, and how do we develop environments in which human beings can live good valuable meaningful lives. Peace is not just about the absence of nuclear war as we know. This is how I always have dealt with these questions and I will continue to do so.

NOTES ON THE INTERVIEWEE

Paul Smoker. Address: The Richardson Institute for Peace Studies, Lancaster University, Lancaster LA1 4YL, England. (Tel: 0524-65201. Fax: 0524-63806.)

Paul Smoker was born in London, England on the 23rd September 1938. After leaving school he studied physics, mathematics, art and educational theory. In 1960 he helped to establish the Peace Research Centre at Langthwaite House, Lancaster where he worked until the Centre became a part of the new University of Lancaster in 1965. Since then he has been based at Lancaster teaching Peace Studies. He has been a visiting professor teaching peace studies at various universities in the United States, Canada, Europe and Asia.

He has published books and articles on various topics including conflict theory, the nuclear arms race, simulation of international relations, peace movements, peace education, utopias and peace theory. Currently he edits the International Peace Research Newsletter and is visiting professor of International Peace Studies in the Faculty of International Relations, Ritsumeikan University, Kyoto, Japan.

Selected publications

Trade, defence and the Richardson theory of arms races: A seven nation study. Journal of Peace Research, 1965, 2(2), 161-176.

Small peace. Journal of Peace Research, 1981, 18(2), 149-157.

Exploding nuclear myths: Evidence from conflict research. Coexistence, 1984, 21, 93-106.

(With H.-F. Rathenow.) Peace education in Great Britain: Some results of a survey. Bulletin of Peace Proposals, 1984, 15, 171-184.

War. In: World encyclopedia of peace. Vol. 2. Oxford: Pergamon, 1986. Pp. 533-535.

Accidental nuclear winter: Implications for deterrence. In: Smoker, P. & Bradley, M. (Eds.) Accidental nuclear war. Tampere: TAPRI, 1988. Pp. 2-13.

Unintended nuclear war. In: Alger, C. & Stohl, M. (Eds.) A just peace through transformation. Boulder, CO: Westview Press, 1988. Pp. 494-510.

Lennart Vriens

1.

AB: As an introduction, could you say a few words about yourself and your interest in the field of "peace education"?

LV: I am working at the University of Utrecht in the Faculty of Education. My teaching tasks are mainly in the field of general education theory; I have also dealt with nursing and nursing theory. My special topical interest is peace education. During the last 15 years or so, I have been working with research and development related to peace education, and I have written many articles on peace education.

I participated in the development of a peace education project for primary schools involving children from 6 to 12. As a part of my doctoral thesis, I also made a research study of children's daily life experiences of war and peace which was described in one chapter of my thesis. Otherwise my thesis emphasized educational theory, and I am trying to find some kind of new legitimization for peace education: I am trying to prove that education in our time should be peace education, because there has been a very great shift in the world, and I think that most educational theories are essentially based on the situation before 1945. I am trying to build up some basic ideas for peace education from a general analysis of current peace issues, from an analysis of the history of peace education and from my own empirical data.

AB: You mentioned earlier two projects that you deal with in your thesis. Is it correct that one of them included developing instructional materials for use in schools?

LV: Yes, we developed some materials, but we did this in close cooperation with teachers, so we tried to find out how teachers could translate some ideas of peace education into concrete materials and pedagogical

processes. We try to see this as a dialectic between the child's option and the teacher's knowledge of peace research facts. We were interested in demonstrating how teachers could "discover" peace and war in the life of children.

We took up some general themes, such as conflicts or social justice, but our intention was to be concrete and try to translate those general principles or values back to the child's world. So social justice was illustrated via the problem of traffic and children's need of room for a playground. International understanding was dealt with in terms of the problems of children from other countries who attended the school. We had topics like the different roles of the father and the mother in the family as well as the role differences between boys and girls within the family. We tried to do all this so that children would not say immediately: oh, this is peace education; but the teacher would conceptualize it as peace education structures. In our opinion, knowledge and skills to understand and handle structures are the basis of more direct peace knowledge. Peace (research) knowledge can hardly function without this basis. We were influenced in many aspects by the theoretical ideas of Galtung on structural violence. I do not share Galtung's view that every instance of inequality should be seen as an injustice. Nevertheless, his ideas were helpful.

This project is briefly described in my thesis, and I make a re-evaluation of it, because the project was evaluated in an insufficient way. I tried to re-evaluate it in terms of action theory, Handlungstheorie. What we did was try to develop our concepts in reality and try to change this reality at the same time.

AB: Is there a more detailed description of this project in other publications than your thesis?

LV: Yes, we assembled a book of materials and a manual

for teachers. This manual has four parts. First, we dealt with the theory of peace education. Second, we related it to curriculum theory, demonstrating how you can work peace education into the curriculum. At that time, all the schools were obliged to develop their own school curriculum and to make a document of this; so we said, if you want peace education you can do it in this way, and we presented some ideas about the aims of peace education and how to formulate educational objectives, not only in product terms, but also in process terms.

We had some of the many materials that were developed in the schools, and the schools could take these materials and use them; they had the right to copy them for their pupils. So the teachers were offered ideas, they were offered our philosophy, and they were offered many materials; and then we hoped that they would be in a position to develop their own projects adequate for their own situation. The last part of the manual listed information sources and documents.

AB: Could you also say a little bit more about the second study referred to in your thesis: the study of the children's conceptions of war and peace? What were the most interesting or conspicuous findings in that study?

LV: I think one of our most conspicuous findings was that there is indeed a special child culture of war and peace, and that it's additionally complicated because boys have a special boys' culture, and girls have a special girls' culture. This is a complex phenomenon. These cultures are strongly influenced by our adult world problems, but the children have to find their own way. It's not adequate to think that children do not have enough insight into the problems, or that children are not yet capable of understanding the problems and so on. Children always have to

construct some kind of a coherent world view, and they have to integrate what they perceive about current problems into this world view.

A second conclusion drawn in this study is that boys and girls have their own special development as to problems of war and peace - they have taken different positions. Boys seem to be more positive to war, whereas girls are more in favour of peace.

AB: Is what you said about sex differences true on all age levels you dealt with?

LV: Yes, it is. However, we did find that both boys and girls of six have great difficulty understanding what is meant by war and peace. They have a vague feeling that war is something threatening and peace is harmony. Older children are more open to the world, and they develop clearer concepts of war and peace. Then we note the differences between boys and girls more easily. At first boys have very positive feelings about war. They like to play war games. They like to be soldiers in their fantasy and they are interested in weapons, real and imagined ones. They like power and strength, and they enjoy violence in television programs. Girls don't like all these things. They don't play war games, they don't see themselves as soldiers, but as victims in wartime. They evaluate violence in television programs as stupid etc. When children are about 11 years old, these things change, especially for boys. Children of that age are well aware of nuclear reality, and from that time on, war cannot be self-evident fun and pleasure any more. Attitudes to war are now more difficult for boys: on the one hand they tend to like war, and on the other hand they realize that real war with atomic weapons is not possible. Girls are more consistent in their negative view of war problems; they are more interested in human relations, and they are more focused on the victim point of view. They say: I don't want war, people shouldn't make war.

I told the pupils about children in the war between

Iran and Iraque, and they saw pictures on television. They were very upset, but some boys said that maybe those countries lack many important things and have a lot of children, so perhaps this was acceptable. But the girls said: No, you cannot do this in this way; so girls are very consistent. Girls also tend to have more faith in people, including politicians, whereas boys seem to be more cynical.

AB: I understand that, in addition to Dutch children, you also had some groups from Canada and Uruguay. Did you get a similar picture from these other groups?

LV: It's a little difficult to make strict comparisons, since the groups are not quite comparable, and we hesitate to make analyses of cultures which we don't understand fully. Anyway, in the Uruguayan group there was not such a clear difference between the drawings of boys and girls. Maybe the culture in that country is more "masculine". (This was a hypothesis of a Latin-American refugee in The Netherlands.) - A comparison with the Canadian children shows that our children are fairly aware of the international community and feel solidarity with children in the Lebanon and in Northern Ireland. We see less of that in the Canadian material.

2.

AB: What do you think of first when you hear the words "peace education"?

LV: I think that peace education is, in essence, good education. I think that peace has to be analyzed just as Galtung did - into "positive peace" and "negative peace" - and I think education is primarily in favour of something and not against something. I define peace education as the kind of education which introduces children into the world in a way that is adjusted to their situation and their possibilities and confronts them with their future responsibilities for preservation of life in this world, inviting them

to accept these possibilities and adapt them to their own situation.

3.

AB: If you think back on your own school days, were there some aspects in your schooling that might be considered an attempt at "peace education"?

LV: No, almost nothing really. I don't remember any special things that were peace education. I had a great interest in history myself, and many things that I learnt there were rather education against peace. However, when I was seven or eight years old, our teacher was asked by some boys in the class to tell us about war. He told us a story that I remember. He told us about some boys who knew that it was war. They were very enthusiastic, and they had toy guns and so on. But then an airplane came and dropped something, and that was a bomb, and the house was destroyed, and the boys saw their father and mother die. The end of the story was: Oh, is that what war is about? A peace-education experience.

4.

AB: Do you believe that schools in your country, as you know them today, contribute to a "peace education"?

LV: I think many schools do. I think we have a long tradition of educational reform in Dutch schools which has left its traces. I think that in about 1900, many new educators accused schools of being militaristic, and they did that after reading Tolstoy. Tolstoy made a comparison between school and army: In the army they march in rows, in school they sit in rows; in the army they have discipline, in school they have discipline, etc.

As early as about 1890, an alternative history method was discussed which was not concerned with the history of wars, but with the history of culture. Most teachers mocked it and made fun of it, but this discussion nevertheless left some traces. In Holland there was a strong connection between an anarchistic

peace movement and the new educational movement, the reform pedagogy.

In our country, there has been a lot of discussion about history and geography books, and attempts have been made to liberate them from prejudice and racism. I know that many teachers have strived to integrate topics that we can call peace education into social training and social studies, so they are talking about conflicts and about the need for understanding between different races. Every year we have a peace week when many schools carry out peace projects, and I know that many teachers have developed their own peace projects.

AB: What can be the reason why peace education has been fairly well developed in your country?

LV: I think there has been a lot of influence from the peace movement. Some people have also tried to develop projects for the educational system, and in the 70s we had four or five different peace education projects, covering every type of school, and I think they made good materials.

AB: Did Maria Montessori have a part in this early influence on peace education in Holland? I know she lived in your country for some time.

LV: Maria Montessori had a large general influence in Holland, but I don't know if Montessori schools saw themselves as peace schools. I don't think so, and I note that her ideas on peace education came after a long period of cooperation with "il Duce"; so I'm a bit reluctant to look up to her as a model peace educator.

5.

AB: Do you think it is at all possible for schools to contribute to a "peace education"? If so, what are some of the steps and measures to be taken that you think of first?

LV: I do think it's possible for schools to contribute to peace education. Just one important thing: Peace

education is not only a matter of methods and tricks. Peace education has to do with personal involvement, and I think that in my opinion peace education starts with the development of some basic values, peace values. The base for these values is laid in the family, I think. One important aspect is trust (can we trust people?). You cannot explain trust if you haven't experienced it when you were very young. It's not a verbal experience, it's a pre-verbal experience; it's not a rational experience, it's a pre-rational experience. Solidarity is also an extremely important peace value.

The school can try to develop those values further, but if those values have not been present in the family, then it's very difficult to do this job in school. I think this is the basis of implicit peace education. The school has a special task in dealing with implicit peace education, but it should also deal with explicit peace education.

AB: Can you illustrate further the meaning of implicit peace education in school?

LV: A school philosophy must be shaped by peace values. You cannot talk to children in a meaningful way about social justice if the school system is not a social-justice system. And you cannot talk effectively with children about non-violence, if the school system itself is violent. I think these attitudes and skills should be there before schools introduce children systematically to the political problems of the world. So I think that when school starts, peace education should deal with everyday experiences in the children's own lives. Then, when children are 10-11 years old, they want information about the political problems, and I think schools should introduce them and try to give children the tools and the skills to understand these political problems. So I think schools have very important tasks.

AB: You have talked about skills, knowledge and values.

Do you also see peace education as something to do with action? Should you as a teacher inspire children to act according to these values?

LV: This I am not so sure about. I'm not sure whether peace education should lead children into action. Maybe this can be a consequence, but I think then it must be an action of the children themselves - I think peace education must not stress children into actions approved by adults. You should be careful here, because there's a kind of gray zone between what's peace education and what's indoctrination. We are responsible for the children, and we must take a careful position: we must teach them to think about the problems, we must invite them to come to a standpoint of their own, but we must not be too specific in our own influence.

6.

AB: What would be some of the possible differences in peace education approaches among younger and older students in schools?

LV: I think I have already talked about this to some extent. I think that older students need much more information about what's really going on in the world; older students should be oriented in the world. If you are to be responsible for it, then you should know about it. However, it's not necessary to be a war expert or a peace expert to understand that you shouldn't use atomic bombs; and it's not necessary to know the exact number of missiles on the West side and on the East side. But among other things children should learn how to make moral judgements.

It is important - when dealing with younger as well as older students - that the information should not destroy all the joy of life. I think that peace education should always try to open up possibilities, or to give the impression that we are working with the world; that we are trying to build a new and better

world and that we are not only against something bad. It has also some relation to the tricky mental-health issue. Some people have talked about anxiety about nuclear war as a problem of public health, as a problem concerning the mental health of young people. This is worth discussing, but you might also ask: Who is mentally healthy? The person who is scared, or the person who is not scared?

7.

AB: If you were an upper-secondary school teacher in a subject with which you are particularly familiar, how would you like to make the students more conscious of and more prepared for problems of peace, within that subject?

LV: One thing worth thinking about is this: When young people are between 13 and 18 years old, they are very busy with themselves. Then, I think, peace education may have a better chance if you can show that this is important for themselves: but then we must also show that it has parallels within the world at large. So you should not only talk about racism in Namibia, but you should also talk about racism when you go to a disco. You should not only talk about violence and politics in the world, but also about the feeling of being safe in the big cities as a girl. Can you feel safe walking in Amsterdam, for example? You can try to connect these levels, and then you may have a chance. I think that it's very important for a teacher to avoid giving the children the impression that they have to accept his or her ideas.

I think history is a very important topic for peace education, and I think it's a pity that in Holland history is not a subject in the final examinations for most students. It is very important to understand political processes and the historical roots of some of our current conflicts.

8.

AB: In international debates, the terms "disarmament education" and "peace education" have been used, in addition to some other related terms ("global education", "education for international understanding" etc.). Do you have any comments and preferences as to this terminology?

LV: I prefer the term "peace education", and maybe I can use "global education". But I think that such things as "disarmament education" and "education for international understanding" are only parts of peace education. In my opinion, peace - especially positive peace - is more than disarmament, and I think that one of the worst things about the peace movement has been that it has not been a peace movement, but only a disarmament movement, or even a nuclear disarmament movement and nothing else. However, you sometimes choose a term for strategic reasons. For example, "global education" may be a better term for governments than peace education.

In my thesis, I elaborated a theory of a pedagogy of hope. A concept of positive peace can be a concept of hope for education. The positive peace concept can be a very good description of a hopeful future. It has some potentials for being a concrete, realistic utopia, and I think education needs something like a realistic utopia. Education is an intentional process, and I think one of the problems of most educators, and even politicians, is that they have no explicit idea of the intentions of education.

AB: Have people in your country ever reacted negatively to the term peace education?

LV: Yes, there have been some negative reactions. Politicians have often accused peace educators of being guilty of indoctrination, and the politicians never have to argue about it. Our former Prime Minister said that peace education is anti-Americanism and indoctrination of the worst kind, and when he was invited to discuss it,

he said: No, that's not necessary. I made a conceptual analysis of indoctrination in my thesis, because I think peace educators must be careful not to indoctrinate children and youngsters. But most people who accuse peace educators of being guilty of indoctrination only seem to say: "You just teach children things that I don't want you to teach them." And then they use the term indoctrination.

9.

AB: In many countries, questions related to disarmament and peace are highly controversial. Would you anticipate any difficulties, for example with parents or other members of the community, when introducing peace education in schools? If so, what kind of difficulties? Do you see any way out of such problems?

LV: We often meet those difficulties. We have parents who say: "No, we don't want peace education, because we don't want our children to be indoctrinated into the point of view of the peace movement." Mostly it's possible to organize a discussion with those parents about the topic.

It's a very controversial issue for many town councils in the Netherlands, and it is handled very differently. Some town councils propagate peace education for their schools and invite the independent schools, mostly of Christian origin, to take part in this peace education too; but there are also town councils who forbid peace education, and many of the politicians who do this belong to the same political parties as those who recommend it, so it's really not politically consistent. The central representatives of the party have to find a formula and sometimes say: "We are not against peace education as long as it isn't indoctrination!"

I think it's very important to explain to parents and others that peace education is an opportunity for children to think about the peace problem, to tell them what peace education really is. Many parents

and politicians say: "OK, what you are doing is beautiful, but just don't call it peace education." It's very important to try to understand people who don't want peace education.

10.

AB: What needs to be done in teacher training in order to prepare future teachers more adequately for the area of "peace education"?

LV: Teacher training should try to get the future teachers interested in the peace problem. Maybe they should be introduced to the peace-education projects that teachers and other organizations have developed. They should get the intellectual baggage of the peace problem, but they must also see that it's possible to handle this in the classroom, even under difficult circumstances.

There have been some projects which have tried to develop peace education in teacher training courses, but so far the development is not satisfactory.

AB: What about in-service training for teachers? Are there such courses dealing with peace education at the present time?

LV: Yes, there are some. Sometimes we have city councils who try to develop peace education. Then they might arrange specific courses on peace education for teachers, and sometimes they establish a Center for Peace Education to make materials available to the schools and to organize evenings with teachers. There is a lot going on.

11.

AB: Is there anything else that you would like to add about the school and peace education?

LV: Maybe one thing, and that is: peace education is not a separate subject. Sometimes it can be useful to organize some kind of separate project on peace education. But I think the best thing you can do is try to develop ideas about peace education which

can be integrated in the total program. There should be an integrated philosophy, addressing the question: "What are we doing with our children in school and in the various subjects?" We may have blind spots where we do not let peace-related facts or ideas come into the subjects as they could. In our history textbooks, the history of peace has been such a blind spot.

NOTES ON THE INTERVIEWEE

Lennart Vriens. Born in 1945. Worked as a primary-school teacher 1967-1969. Studied pedagogy and became a lecturer at the National University of Utrecht, Social Science Faculty in 1974. Among other things, he has taught peace education in the Social Science Faculty, cooperated in the development of a primary-school project on peace education, and headed a qualitative project on children's everyday experiences of peace and war.

Examples of publications

"Das ist ja wohl kein Krieg mehr." In: Danner, H. & Lippitz, W. (Eds.) Wahrnehmen, Verstehen, Handeln. München, 1984.

Peace education and children's experiences. Phenomenology and Pedagogy, 1984, 1(3).

(With R. Aspeslagh.) Peace education: Alternating between the person and structures. Gandhi Marg, 1984, 6, 313-330.

(With R. Aspeslagh.) Friedenspädagogik: Von Back-to-Basics zu einer neuen Basis. In: Heitkämper, P. & Huschke-Rein, R. (Eds.) Allgemeinbildung im Atomzeitalter. Weinheim/Basel, 1986.

Pedagogiek tussen vrees en vrede: Een pedagogische theorie over vredesopvoeding. (Doct. thesis.) Antwerpen: Internationale Vredesinformatiedienst, 1988.

Peace and war in the child's perception of its environment. In: Verhellen, E. & Spiesschaert, F. (Eds.) Ombudswork for children: A way of improving the position of children in society. Leuven/Amersfoort, 1989.

1.

AB: As an introduction, could you say a few words about yourself and your interest in the field of "peace education"?

RW: I am working as a peace researcher at the University of Jyväskylä in Finland, at the Department of Education. My interest in peace education has existed for a long time. Prior to my present work, which deals with peace education in the primary school, I worked with the development of a peace education curriculum for pre-school children. Furthermore, I made a study of young people's concepts of peace and war, level of moral judgement and self-esteem. In this study, I noticed that there was a positive relation between the level of moral judgement on the one hand, and peace activities and positive attitudes to peace on the other.

2.

AB: What do you think of first when you hear the word "peace education"?

RW: To me, the basic ideas behind peace education are human rights, equality and justice. People are struggling or striving to acquire human rights all over the world - not only in their own personal life - and to save their environment and their life in general. To me peace education means nearly the same thing as humanistic education: to educate people to honour human dignity, human rights and justice.

AB: How would you as a psychologist describe the traditions of violence? What is it that keeps them alive?

RW: It is important to state that they are not the result of some inherent aggressive human nature. However, there are several psychological factors that may be mentioned. For example, there are various elements in the education of boys and in our general culture that foster "militaristic" attitudes. It should be an important task to demonstrate how the picture of the ideal man as aggressive, competitive and power-oriented in the upbringing of boys and young men is a hindrance in the development of a more peaceful world. Propagandistic enemy images and threat images, supported by groups with vested interests in the war industry, may contribute to feelings of insecurity and thus enforce a felt need for a strong defensive posture. A conventional upbringing with a heavy emphasis on respect for authority and obedience can also be seen as an aid in maintaining conditions for war in the sense that obedient soldiers are necessary in order to realize war. Peace education should be designed to counteract these factors that foster insecurity as well as authoritarian and "militaristic" attitudes.

Peace education has often been related to non-violence. Perhaps we cannot learn to love everyone equally, and we might be afraid of groups of people who are strangers to us. However, we could learn that violence is the worst way of "solving" problems. And nowadays we have to realize that the violence against the environment is a very dangerous type of violence. - Peace education means both a continuous struggle for a better understanding of those who are different from us, and a struggle against structural violence.

The question of "inner harmony" in peace education has often been mentioned. As far as I understand, inner harmony is an important aspect. At schools or other educational institutions, different methods for meditation or relaxation could be used. But I think

that this approach is not enough. A harmonious person might be very nice to his or her friends etc., but not really care for others. That is why I think that the deep moral values, related to an understanding that all humans are basically the same and equal, are more important than our own "inner harmony". The desire to make this world better also for exploited people is important. The challenge of peace education is how to stimulate and develop these values and desires.

3.

AB: If you think back on your own school days, were there some aspects in your schooling that might be considered an attempt at "peace education"?

RW: No, there was very little that might be considered attempts at peace education. I have two vivid memories of activities in our class that were directed to the world outside the classroom. In the first case, we were allowed to plan a drama and present that to other people. In the other case, we collected clothes and other things from my class and sent them to poor families in Finland. This second activity may be said to be related to some aspects of peace education. But, in general, our teachers were quite authoritarian, and we were confronted with quite a lot of black-and-white attitudes, for instance, in subjects like religion and history. In this way, we were subjected to an education that tended to foster attitudes quite contrary to those favored in peace education.

4.

AB: Do you believe that schools in your country, as you know them today, contribute to a "peace education"?

RW: We have had a lively debate in Finland about peace education, and some teachers now make important contributions in this field. However, I think that in most classrooms there is still very little done that might be considered peace education.

5.

AB: Do you think that it is at all possible for schools to contribute to a "peace education"? If so, what are some of the steps and measures to be taken that you think of first?

RW: Yes, I think that it is quite possible for schools to contribute to peace education. It is possible to teach the pupils about different countries and cultures in a way that makes them understand the cultural roots, the different religions and ideologies. This is important in order to understand the existing differences between people as well as their basic common needs and similarities. It is also possible to give the pupils basic knowledge about important global problems, such as the pollution problem, the extreme poverty and hunger, the exploitation and spoiling of the environment, the risks connected with armament and nuclear war. However, I think that this kind of knowledge should mainly be for the older pupils in our schools, not for children at the primary level.

An important aspect of education in this respect is how we approach our pupils. We should not just hand over a package of knowledge. Instead, we should start with the problems our pupils have in their own minds and in their own reality, in a way similar to the pedagogies of Freinet and Freire, where people are encouraged to find solutions to problems that are important to them and to search for knowledge that is of use in this process.

A major aim is to make this world better; and I think that this aim of making the world a better place, with equality, justice and a healthy environment, is to be kept in mind in our efforts to deal with various minor problems and in our efforts to acquire meaningful knowledge. A major step in peace education is to start thinking about the world as we want it to be.

AB: You have been studying such characteristics as moral values and self-esteem in your research. How do you look upon the relations between knowledge, moral values and self-esteem and the importance of taking these aspects into account in our schools?

RW: I think that it is no use getting knowledge about the problems of the world if you do not have human rights and equality as basic values. Knowledge of different cultures and different countries may be of little importance from the peace education point of view if you do not have this kind of moral orientation, valuing human dignity, equality and justice.

It has been said and written many times in discussions of peace education that it is important to have self-esteem first. I think that self-esteem might be important, but it is not enough for anyone to want to make this world better for others than him- or herself. In fact, I suppose that there are many people with high self-esteem in the world, in high power positions, whose actions are characterized by exploitation and racism, and who are supporting militaristic solutions of the conflicts. So the idea of self-esteem as the most important starting-point for peace education might not be correct. Instead, I would like to emphasize the importance of moral development and education related to values.

I have been strengthened in this view by results from my empirical studies, where I found no relationship among the boys studied between self-esteem and positive attitudes to peace or peace activities. On the other hand, relationships were found - as I mentioned before - between the level of moral judgement and activities and attitudes related to peace. Of course, I cannot generalize my results, because the data and methods were restricted.

6.

AB: What would be some of the possible differences in peace education approaches among younger and older students in schools?

RW: An important point is that it is not wise to inform the younger students about the dangers of nuclear warfare and the terrible results of global pollution. Young children's thinking is characterized by a level of concrete operations which makes it difficult for them to understand these issues, and it would be wrong to risk increasing their anxiety by handing over too much information of this kind to them. But if children ask, then it is a good time to discuss these things. Older students, on the other hand, should deal with these issues, of course. While such differences in content would be natural, I do not think that the kind of pedagogy has to be very different for younger and older students. In both cases, I would prefer non-authoritarian and problem-oriented methods, where problems as experienced by the students themselves are good starting-points, and where group discussions, workshops, drama etc. are important aids in the process of acquiring and handling knowledge.

7.

AB: If you were an upper-secondary school teacher in a subject with which you are particularly familiar, how would you like to make the students more conscious of and more prepared for problems of peace, within that subject?

RW: To me, the basic educational procedures would be similar in most school subjects. For instance, I would like to ask my students to think about things within the subject which they themselves feel could

be connected with problems of peace. After a discussion of these issues, we might find out together what would be important to study in order to understand these problems. A basic approach in my teaching would be to start from the conceptions and ideas that my students already have. This might mean that students are requested to write down their own current thoughts about problems they find important. After writing down their thoughts, they may read them aloud, and we could start discussions related to the worries and thoughts of the students. This might be one way of beginning work on peace education, since ideas of peace and war will probably be one important area of young people's worries. This would also be one example of non-authoritarian educational techniques, and such methods would in themselves contribute to peace education.

8.

AB: In international debates, the terms "disarmament education" and "peace education" have been used, in addition to some other related terms ("global education", "education for international understanding" etc.). Do you have any comments and preferences as to this terminology?

RW: To me, peace education is the broader concept, under which there may be various narrower areas, such as disarmament education or education for international understanding. I prefer to use the term peace education. To me it is important to give the students a broad view of this area and to get them to understand the interrelatedness of, for example, racism, inequality and armaments. Consequently, it would not be a good strategy to single out one part of the total complex problem area. Hence, my preference for a broad teaching strategy leads me to prefer a broad term.

9.

AB: In many countries, questions related to disarmament and peace are highly controversial. Would you anticipate any difficulties, for example with parents or other members of the community, when introducing peace education in schools? If so, what kind of difficulties? Do you see any way out of such problems?

RW: Here in Finland, we can notice some change of attitudes. Some years ago, just talking in terms of peace education would have led many people to think about leftist propaganda. We now have in Finland a Law for Basic Schooling and a Law for Day Care (both from 1983) where it is stated that education should include education for peace, internationalism and common responsibility. This means a clear legalization of teachers' work in peace education, and this has contributed to a continued change of attitudes. But some people, although now a much smaller group, consider peace education to be very leftist and "dangerous". They really do not know what peace education means. So there is still a strong need for public information and discussion.

10.

AB: What needs to be done in teacher training in order to prepare future teachers more adequately for the area of "peace education"?

RW: I think we need seminars for teachers on peace education. I said earlier that there are many prejudices in this area, and that many people do not know at all what the term stands for. This is probably still true for many teachers. This would be an important area for teacher training all over the world, and it should take up basic concepts and aims as well as teaching methods. I also think that the kind of pedagogy I mentioned earlier, the Freinet or Freire type of problem-solving and discussion approach, would be relevant also in teacher training in order to get the teachers committed.

11.

AB: Is there anything else that you would like to add about the school and peace education?

RW: I think that one aspect of peace education in school would be to train students in critical thinking, especially in relation to the mass media. It would be important to teach them to analyze the form and content of the news as presented in newspapers and TV programs, to study where it comes from (from which countries and through what kind of broadcasting systems). They should also be made aware of the ideas about human nature in general, as well as about various groups, that are often spread by popular videos, films and books. Students should be made aware that such materials contain both unconscious prejudices and conscious propaganda efforts that support and increase enemy images and ideas about the supposedly natural character or necessity of violence and war. This kind of critical thinking and analysis training is a very important part of peace education.

AB: You have mentioned enemy images a couple of times, and I know that this is a concept that you have been interested in. Can you tell me a little more about your views on this topic, for example: How do you define enemy images? Is it inevitable that a national-level image of the enemy must develop? And what kind of research would be of interest in this area?

RW: The image of the enemy is one of the most obvious psychological antecedents of armament and war. War propaganda deliberately creates an image of the enemy. It could be defined in various ways, but typically an enemy image is a commonly held, stereotyped and dehumanized image of a specific outgroup. Such an image provides a focus for fears and threats, and a lot of undesirable qualities are projected onto the enemy. It is often held that all nations have such images of an enemy nation. But

there are clear indications that the strength and character of enemy images vary considerably, both between nations and between different types of people. In Finland, I have made preliminary studies that show that a relatively low percentage of people have enemy images. I think that an important research aim would be to coordinate a study of the image of the enemy across different countries and various subgroups. Knowledge of current variations and attempts to explain such variations may be extremely valuable in promoting a better understanding of the processes that lead to peace or war.

NOTES ON THE INTERVIEWEE

Riitta Wahlström previously worked as a school psychologist and lecturer in psychology. Her last six years have been devoted to peace research. She made a postgraduate study of young people's attitudes to war and peace and their relation to self-esteem and moral judgement. She has been involved as a researcher in a peace education project for pre-school children. She is one of the signers of an international statement on violence (The Sevilla Declaration, May 1986). At present she is leading a project on peace education and international education for the primary school.

Examples of publications

Riitta Wahlström has a long list of publications and conference papers. Most are written in Finnish. Here follow some examples of presentations in English or Swedish:

Psykologiska utgångspunkter för fredsfostran. /Psychological prerequisites for peace education. / Nordisk Psykologi, 1984, 36, 160-168.

De ungas uppfattningar om krig och fred. /Conceptions of war and peace among young people. / Nordisk Psykologi, 1985, 37, 298-309.

Fear of war, conceptions of war, and peace activities: Their relation to self-esteem in young people. In: Solantaus, T. et al. (Eds.) Impact of the threat of nuclear war on children and adolescents. Proceedings of an International Research Symposium, 1985. Pp. 104-111.

An enemy image as a psychological antecedent of warfare and armament. In: European Psychologists for Peace. Proceedings of the Congress in Helsinki, 8.-10.8.1986. Pp. 144-154.

Forskare mot våld. Deklaration om våld. /Researchers against violence. Declaration on violence. / Nordisk Psykologi, 1986, 38, 303-305.

Educating preschool children for shared responsibility and peace. Reprints and Miniprints (Malmö: School of Education), No. 590, 1988.

Enemy images and peace education. Reprints and Miniprints (Malmö, Sweden: School of Education), No. 660, 1989.

1.

AB: As an introduction, could you say a few words about yourself and your interest in the field of "peace education"?

ZW: My name is Zlmarian Walker; I live in Brasilia in Brazil. I am an American by birth, and I have a doctorate in education from the University of Massachusetts. I have lived in Brazil almost 15 years. During the first years I worked in universities in the area of teacher education. At the moment I work in an international school, not affiliated with any government, but in which we have students from 30 countries. In our daily school activities, we try to create a peace education format. I have worked in the international Bahai community, and that is how I became interested in peace education. I have been looking for ways to make it a reality, and I found professionally and spiritually that peace education is a way for me to work.

AB: Could you tell me a little bit more about the school?

ZW: A group Bahai professionals in the area of education - many of whom have worked in different countries; I think between us we have worked in 8 or 10 countries - decided to start a school that would be in a sense a laboratory for developing peace education concepts and also an opportunity to put peace education in practice, because when you have students from such diverse backgrounds, it's not a luxury but a necessity to try this. - It's an elementary school. About 1/3 of the students are children of diplomats, maybe 1/3 children of other people who work in the international area (in business, for the UN or as missionaries, etc.), and the rest of the students are from regular Brazilian families who feel that they need to have an international kind of education. It's a bilingual school: We

work half a day in Portuguese, and half a day in English.

AB: And your particular own duties there?

ZW: I am the peace education coordinator, whatever that means, and I teach kindergarten and some subjects in the 9th grade.

2.

AB: What do you think of first when you hear the words "peace education"?

ZW: I think of so many things. The first I think of is a global perspective and taking positive steps to create a peaceful world; teaching students what these steps might be and giving them some sense of responsibility to take some of those steps. I don't know which ones they want to take, but some of them I hope they will take.

AB: So it is not only a kind of knowledge - it's a kind of action you are talking about?

ZW: Yes. A peaceful world is an absolute necessity, and these children at an international school will have special opportunities to work for peace. I also work with teacher training seminars. In many Brazilian cities I have done seminars for teachers in regular public schools: an in-service training on peace education. I have found the response to be incredible; if I was able to, I could work with this all the time.

3.

AB: If you think back on your own school days, were there some aspects in your schooling that might be considered an attempt at "peace education"? Did you go to school in the United States?

ZW: Yes. No, I can't think of anything related to peace in my formal education. I sometimes ask a similar question in peace education seminars, and if anyone raises a hand, it is related to the university level: it may be one class or one talk, but this is extremely rare. Knowing how rare it is, you would think that

peace education was an unimportant or irrelevant issue. And yet, it is so vital.

4.

AB: Do you believe that schools in your country, as you know them today, contribute to a "peace education"?

ZW: In general, no. - I did a small, very simple study on Brazilian textbooks, just looking for the word peace and references to international, cooperative organizations and events. In the textbooks that I looked at - I have only looked at about 15 textbooks for the elementary school in social studies and related areas - there were only two references to peace and those references were to peace treaties. So the word peace was in there because it was a treaty. One had a formal explanation of the United Nations. However, if you looked at the references to war, there were about 40. This was just a very small and informal study for our own group. But it fits in with my feeling that peace education in this country is very rare so far.

5.

AB: Do you think it is at all possible for schools to contribute to a "peace education"? If so, what are some of the steps and measures to be taken that you think of first?

ZW: I think it is both possible and necessary. Steps to be taken are many. Working with teachers I think is the easiest first step, because many teachers are aware that there are some missing elements in what they give the students, and many of them are sincerely concerned with the world situation. They don't always know how to teach about it or what to do.

Maybe the second step is to create more instructional materials. I have published a book in this area, which is very tiny and very insignificant, but I know that there are people thinking about it now and starting to work on materials. So far we don't have real publications in the area; we don't

have teacher manuals; we don't have practical exercises.

The third step would be to arrange curriculum development groups to present curricular materials to local, state or national authorities. I have been talking with some friends about a national curriculum project, and we will probably do something of this sort, but I think that local and state approaches might be easier.

AB: If you think at the level of a specific classroom, what do you think the teacher could do to enhance peace education?

ZW: I guess I just talk about what we have done. We do this in two ways: we have special activities and we do things within the regular curriculum. The special activities generally emphasize United Nations days and similar events, so we arrange programs about those events, do research related to this, and discuss. Within the regular classroom activities we use cooperative frameworks, and we work with sexism and racism. Our classrooms are very diverse, which is excellent, but the teachers really have to be aware of the problems implicit in such a situation. Teachers have to organize their daily activities to make sure that everyone is included and that the children are consciously aware that people are being included because they have something to offer. We try to promote the view that diversity is something wonderful, we do cooperative games and try to avoid too much competition. I try to stimulate the teachers; I give them materials; I train them; but they are really responsible for their own work.

AB: So in general you think peace education is something that could and should be included in various subjects and should not be a specific subject?

ZW: In elementary school I don't think it should be a specific subject. In higher grades it may sometimes be especially emphasized in one particular subject.

6.

AB: What would be some of the possible differences in peace education approaches among younger and older students in schools?

ZW: I think, at least in our case, with younger children we try to build the concepts of peace education into their daily lives. As they get older they can differentiate the different issues involved in these concepts and you can talk about them and present them. The older children definitely can see: Oh, this is a problem. With the younger children we try not to emphasize the problem aspects; we try to show a model or norm. Cooperation is worked with as the norm; we do not talk about the lack of cooperation as a problem. With the older students, you can treat these things separately.

7.

AB: If you were an upper-secondary school teacher in a subject with which you are particularly familiar, how would you like to make the students more conscious of and more prepared for problems of peace, within that subject?

ZW: I taught history and social studies for many years. With older students I think I would really deal with international organizations and transnational concepts and the reality of interdependence: What are you going to do in your life, what could you do in your own life to make these concepts possible? As a history teacher, I have emphasized multicultural history and the contributions of different ethnic groups. What I would like to do now that I wasn't able to do before: For every war I would try to develop "a peace", that is, I would study a peaceful situation for every conflict in order to avoid the traditional concentration on the negative. People have not spent all their time fighting with each other; they really also take steps to live every day and to build a society.

8.

AB: In international debates, the terms "disarmament education" and "peace education" have been used, in addition to some other related terms ("global education", "education for international understanding", etc.). Do you have any comments and preferences as to this terminology?

ZW: I always use the positive when I can. The only thing you can do with a negative concept is to work against it. This is important too, but it shouldn't be the first thing that hits your mind and heart. So I prefer "peace education". I would not use the term "disarmament education". I would use the concepts of disarmament education - of course they are important - but that wouldn't be where I start. "Global education" is alright, but I prefer "peace education".

9.

AB: In many countries, questions related to disarmament and peace are highly controversial. Would you anticipate any difficulties, for example with parents or other members of the community, when introducing peace education in schools? If so, what kind of difficulties? Do you see any way out of such problems?

ZW: In our school we seldom meet such difficulties, because parents have chosen to put their children in this particular school and know what we are at. But sometimes, we have two children in the classroom and their two countries are at war or have some particular difficulties. Then we have to walk carefully without compromising our principles. Of course, our school is a bit different from other schools.

Within more general Brazilian schools, there are two types of objections that I have met, especially among teachers in my peace education seminars. The first type is that these are not the problem of Brazil - these are the problems of the Reagans and the Gorbachevs; people feel a certain distance from those

problems. When you begin to define peace in its many aspects of, for example, freedom from structural violence or racism and sexism, when you begin to bring in all these concepts, some people would begin to see that this is a problem also for them. But there is often a certain group who indicate: Sorry, but peace issues are not my problems - why bother me with this? There is another, sometimes related problem. There is a large group of people who feel that we first need to worry about "basics", having the idea that peace is not a basic need.

How could we go around these problems? I think we should take time to define and discuss peace with these people in detail and in such a way that they see the relevance. Most often it works, if we can take enough time.

10.

AB: What needs to be done in teacher training in order to prepare future teachers more adequately for the area of "peace education"?

ZW: First, people need to be aware of the peace issues and the peace education possibilities. Just making people aware is a good step. Then, providing instructional materials and convincing the authorities that this kind of education is useful is an important area. A lot of teachers are really convinced that this is a vital area, but others have to be "warmed up".

AB: This is not a part of the regular teacher training now in Brazil?

ZW: No, in no place that I know of.

AB: When you are giving these seminars for teachers, what do you usually include?

ZW: Usually I include concepts as global perspective, interdependence, racism, sexism. I am making the teachers familiar with organizations that promote peace: Who works for this? How do you find out? What "goes on in peace"? We try to arrive at a vision of

the future - a vision of the future as a peaceful world. Sometimes I also bring in cooperative classroom strategies. I try to make it practical, analyzing literature that the teachers have available, in terms of how it could be used for purposes of peace education.

AB: How much time do you devote to such a session with a group of teachers?

ZW: Outside our own school, it's just maybe a three-day course or a one-day session.

11.

AB: Is there anything else that you would like to add about the school and peace education? For example: Do you know of other people working with peace education besides yourself here in Brazil?

ZW: I only know one or two other people who are involved in this field here. One of them is a friend of mine near Sao Paulo. We have decided to try to build up a big library on peace in Brazil, because people want to do research, and there is no good place to go and look for relevant literature to see what the rest of the world is doing, so we really need to develop a good research library. It may take 30 or 40 years, but that is OK. We have at least started.

NOTES ON THE INTERVIEWEE

Zlmarian Jeanne Walker was born in 1944 in Washington, DC. She graduated from Fisk University in 1966 with a degree in history, having spent one year at Osmania University in Hyderabad, India. She went on to receive a master's degree in communication and a doctorate of education from the University of Indiana in 1968 and the University of Massachusetts in 1973, respectively.

She taught at Texas Southern University in Houston, the Pontifícia Universidade Católica do Rio Grande do Sul in Porto Alegre, Brazil and the Universidade Federal do Rio Grande do Norte in Natal.

During the eighties, she turned to elementary school teaching at the School of the Nations, an international school dedicated to the promotion of world peace, in Brasilia. It was during that period that she became one of the first professionals in Brazil to promote peace education. Her work at the School of the Nations provided an opportunity to develop and test curriculum materials. She spoke on the topic at conferences and schools throughout Brazil and in West Africa.

In 1987, she wrote a paper on "World peace through world education", which was published in Portuguese by the Brazilian Association for Bahá'í Studies. She died in July 1989. At that time she was working on a book on peace education. Fellow teachers at the School of the Nations are finishing the work, and the work is expected to be published in Portuguese in 1990.